



**2009**

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE  
CALIFORNIA DUI MANAGEMENT  
INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN ACCORD WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 757  
CHAPTER 450, 1989 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

**JANUARY 2009**

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER**  
Governor

**DALE E. BONNER, Secretary**  
Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

**GEORGE VALVERDE**  
Director

© California Department of Motor Vehicles, 2009

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE January 2009	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final Report		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 2009 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System		5. FUNDING NUMBERS		
6. AUTHOR(S) Sladjana Oulad Daoud and Helen N. Tashima				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) California Department of Motor Vehicles Research and Development Branch P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  CAL-DMV-RSS-09-228		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE		
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) In this eighteenth annual legislatively-mandated report, 2006 and 2007 DUI data from diverse sources were compiled and cross-referenced for the purpose of developing a single comprehensive DUI data reference and monitoring system. This report presents crosstabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, court sanctions, administrative actions and alcohol-involved crashes. In addition, this report provides 1-year proportions of DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested in each year over a time period of seventeen years. Also, the long-term recidivism curves of the cumulative proportions of DUI reoffenses are shown for all DUI offenders arrested in 1994. Analyses were conducted on the effectiveness of DUI programs on the 1-year postconviction records of those convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving, and on the effectiveness of the 3-month versus 9-month DUI programs on the 1-year postconviction records of first offenders. Two additional subanalyses were conducted to determine if differences in the outcome measures were related to BAC level (below 0.20% and 0.20% and above). The proportions of 2006 convicted first and second offenders who were referred, enrolled, and completed DUI programs are also presented.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Drinking drivers, DUI tracking data system, DUI reporting system, DUI countermeasures, DUI recidivism, alcohol education and rehabilitation, driver license disqualification		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 156		
		16. PRICE CODE		
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT None	

# DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1997 - 2007

	YEAR										
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
DUI Arrest Rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers)	933	908	896	847	803	783	809	792	786	849	863
Total DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	191164	188327	188523	181336	176490	177056	183560	180957	180288	197248	203866
Felony DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	5568	5330	5242	5476	5647	5859	5856	5646	5962	6191	6264
Misdemeanor DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	185596	182997	183281	175860	170843	171197	177704	175311	174326	191057	197602
DUI convictions received to date (by year of arrest) <sup>2</sup>	142381	144235	149820	144519	140672	140139	145143	144324	144748	156595	153348
Percent convicted of DUI as of Sept. 2008 <sup>2</sup>	75%	77%	79%	80%	80%	79%	79%	80%	80%	79%	75%
Alcohol-involved reckless driving convictions <sup>2</sup>	16867	15945	15514	14465	15773	15694	15735	14801	14452	15563	15121
Percent convicted of alcohol reckless as of Sept. 2008 <sup>2</sup>	8.8%	8.5%	8.2%	8.0%	8.9%	8.9%	8.6%	8.2%	8.0%	7.9%	7.4%
Alcohol-involved fatalities <sup>3</sup>	1100	1072	1170	1233	1308	1416	1445	1462	1574	1597	1489
% of total fatalities	30.0	31.0	32.8	33.1	33.3	34.2	34.2	35.7	36.6	38.1	37.5
Alcohol-involved injuries <sup>3</sup>	31189	30985	29833	30971	31806	32013	31322	31538	30810	31099	30783
% of total injuries	10.9	10.7	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.4	10.5	11.2	11.5
Drug-involved fatalities <sup>4</sup>	253	266	290	428	509	639	784	799	880	859	749
% of total fatalities	6.9	7.7	8.2	11.5	13.0	15.6	18.6	19.5	20.4	20.5	18.9
Drug-involved injuries <sup>4</sup>	1682	1549	1774	1917	2106	2373	2580	2646	2722	2421	2464
% of total injuries	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9

<sup>1</sup>These totals do not include duplicate cases as originally reported in the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, MACR data, and as of 2006 the counts for all the years reflect this change.

<sup>2</sup>These data represent a DMV master file count of the number of DUI abstracts (data received from the courts) by year of violation, minus duplicates. Each year, the DUI conviction totals are updated to include the amended and new abstracts for current and previous years. These additions are also reflected in changes for the percent convicted. These totals do not include conviction abstracts not yet received. Thus, for the most recent years, these figures will underestimate the final conviction totals.

<sup>3</sup>These figures include overlap with drugs. That is, drugs are also involved in some of these cases.

<sup>4</sup>These figures include overlap with alcohol. That is, alcohol is also involved in some of these cases. Beginning with the 2007 DUI-MIS report, reporting of drug-involved fatalities is included.

## DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1997 - 2007 (continued)

	YEAR										
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS	205462 <sup>1</sup>	238612 <sup>1</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242	239580	247568	339796 <sup>3</sup>	362859
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828	168569	185481	192213
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949	19967	19374	22044	22112
.08 First-offender suspensions	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975	116022	107466	118468	123594
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413	32903	38097	41420	42979
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936	3632	3549	3528
Commercial driver actions	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853	3801	3525	2974	2903
Chemical test refusal actions	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399	9353	9599	9315	9581
.01 Test refusal suspensions	134	229	268	270	280	290	341	326	364	419	426
.08 Test refusal suspensions	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925	6091	5603	5347	5627
.08 Test refusal revocations	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936	3632	3549	3528
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>2</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	769 <sup>1</sup>	1026 <sup>1</sup>	918	741	714	896	794	838	737	941	1061
First-offender suspensions	4847 <sup>1</sup>	9588 <sup>1</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521	31012	39078	110525 <sup>3</sup>	124436
Misdemeanor	3834 <sup>1</sup>	7497 <sup>1</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298	28799	36808	108227 <sup>3</sup>	122102
Felony	1013 <sup>1</sup>	2091 <sup>1</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223	2213	2270	2298	2334
Second-offender S/R actions	22945 <sup>1</sup>	40238 <sup>1</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737	28400	30294	32680	34296
Misdemeanor	22532 <sup>1</sup>	39065 <sup>1</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160	27847	29699	32046	33649
Felony	413 <sup>1</sup>	633 <sup>1</sup>	485	526	577	597	577	553	595	634	647
Third-offender revocations	5569 <sup>1</sup>	9397 <sup>1</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953	5581	6720	7649	8063
Misdemeanor	5471 <sup>1</sup>	9167 <sup>1</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758	5429	6537	7424	7830
Felony	98 <sup>1</sup>	230 <sup>1</sup>	121	148	142	175	195	152	183	225	233
Fourth-offender revocations	1821 <sup>1</sup>	2998 <sup>1</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767	1921	2170	2520	2790
TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS	35951 <sup>1</sup>	63247 <sup>1</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772	67752	78999	154315 <sup>3</sup>	170646

<sup>1</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.<sup>2</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.<sup>3</sup>This count has increased as a result of the law change, effective 09/20/2005, which assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUIs and removed this responsibility from the courts.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2009 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

- Alcohol-involved traffic fatalities decreased by 6.8% in 2007, for the first time after eight years of a continuous rising trend (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- Drug-involved fatalities declined for the second consecutive year (by 12.8% in 2007), but still reflect an increase of almost 200% in the past decade, from 253 in 1997 to 749 in 2007 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- The number of persons injured in alcohol-involved crashes decreased slightly by 1.0% in 2007, following a slight increase of 0.9% in 2006 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- DUI arrests increased by 3.4% in 2007, following an increase of 9.4% in 2006, and a decrease of 0.4% in 2005 (see Table 1).
- The DUI arrest rate rose by 1.6% in 2007, yet still represents a 7.5% reduction from the arrest rate in 1997 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- 15.5% of all 2006 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 15.8% in 2005. 6.3% of 2006 DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly lower than 6.6% in 2005 (see Table 19).
- Among 2007 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (45.9%) again constituted the largest racial/ethnic group, as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999). Hispanics continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population (35.8% in 2007). This is shown in Figure 3.
- The median (midpoint) age of an arrested DUI offender in 2007 was 30 years. Less than 1% of arrested DUI offenders were juveniles (under age 18). This is shown in Table 3a.
- Among convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2006, 73.5% were first offenders and 26.5% were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous ten

years). The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at 37% (see Table 10).

- The median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on Administrative Per Se (APS) forms, was 0.15% in 2006, same as last year, yet almost double the California illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08% (see Table 9a).
- 9.4% of 2006 DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, which is a decrease from 10.3% in 2005 (see Table 8).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge with appreciation the many individuals who have contributed to the success of this project. In particular, we wish to acknowledge the cooperation of the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, in providing annual DUI arrest data and documentation. The contributions of Debbie McKenzie, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, in transforming mainframe computer files into readable data tables and figures, as well as her general assistance in the production of this report, are acknowledged with appreciation. We also would like to acknowledge the contributions of Patrice Rogers, Research Program Specialist II, Henry T. Lai, Staff Programmer Analyst, Leonard A. Marowitz, Research Manager II, Alcohol/Drug Projects, and David J. DeYoung, Chief, Research and Development Branch.

### Report Authors:

Sladjana Oulad Daoud, Research Program Specialist I and  
Helen N. Tashima, Research Program Specialist II, Principal Investigators

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1997-2007 .....	i
HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2009 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
INTRODUCTION .....	1
SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS .....	4
SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS .....	12
SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS .....	24
SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS .....	34
DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES .....	37
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders from 1990-2006 .....	37
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2006 .....	40
The Proportions of DUI Program Referrals, Enrollments, and Completions for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2006 .....	43
Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders .....	44
DUI PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS .....	50
DUI Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol-Reckless Driving .....	53
Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders .....	54
Results of the Evaluation of the 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels Below 0.20% Versus 0.20% and Above .....	56
Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels of 0.20% and Above .....	57
SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS .....	59
SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL .....	63
DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS .....	75
HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975 .....	76
REFERENCES .....	90
GLOSSARY .....	94



**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

## APPENDICES

<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
A	ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 757 - CHAPTER 450 .....	97
B	APPENDIX TABLES .....	99
B1	2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	99
B2	2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE .....	114
B3	TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT .....	124
B4	2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS .....	133
B5	DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS AND 3- AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM DRIVERS .....	156

## LIST OF TABLES

1	DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2005-2007 .....	8
2	2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	9
3a	2007 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	10
3b	2007 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	10
3c	DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 1997-2007 .....	11
4	2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX .....	17
5	MATCHABLE 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX .....	18

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

### LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
6 ADJUSTED 2006 DUI CONVICTION RATES AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY.....	18
7 TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS.....	19
8 ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY.....	21
9a 2006 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS.....	22
9b 2006 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21.....	23
10 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND REPORTED BAC LEVEL.....	23
11 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS.....	26
12 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS.....	27
13a ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2006.....	38
13b 2006 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS.....	41
13c 2006 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS.....	42
14 COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2006.....	43
15 CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES FOR 1994 DUI OFFENDERS.....	44

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)****LIST OF TABLES (continued)**

<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
16a	THE EFFECT OF DUI PROGRAM ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING .....	54
16b	FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS .....	55
16c	FIRST OFFENDER 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS BELOW 0.20% VERSUS 0.20% AND ABOVE .....	56
16d	FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS 0.20% AND ABOVE .....	57
17	MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1997-2007 .....	61
18	ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES .....	62
19	DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 1996-2006 .....	67
20	2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	68
21	2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	68
22	2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND SOBRIETY LEVEL .....	69

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

### LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
23 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 1996-2006 .....	70
24a 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX .....	70
24b 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED) .....	70
24c 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND TYPE OF CRASH .....	71
25a SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES .....	72
25b SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED) .....	72
26a 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS .....	73
26b 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED) .....	73
27 2006 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES .....	74

### LIST OF FIGURES

1 DUI management information system .....	2
2 DUI arrests 1997-2007 .....	5

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

## LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
3	Percentage of 2007 DUI arrests and 2007 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.....	7
4	DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV and conviction rates, 1997-2007.....	14
5	Relative likelihood of conviction by race/ethnicity.....	17
6	Percentage of representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2006).....	25
7	Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2006).....	37
8	Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2006).....	39
9a	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction, and first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incidents (alcohol crashes, major convictions, APS suspensions and DUI FTAs).....	45
9b	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions.....	46
9c	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.....	47
9d	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date).....	48
9e	Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2000 DUI drivers.....	48
10a	Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2006-2007 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.....	53
10b	Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2006) by length of DUI program.....	55
11	Percentage of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1997-2007.....	65
12	Alcohol- and drug-involved total fatalities, 1997-2007.....	65


## INTRODUCTION

This report is the eighteenth Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System, produced in response to Assembly Bill 757 (Friedman), Chapter 450, 1989 legislative session (see Appendix A). This bill required the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to "establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted" of DUI in order to provide "accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics" to enhance "the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions." The need for such a data system had long been documented by numerous authorities, including the 1983 Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. In responding to this legislative mandate, this report combines and cross-references DUI data from diverse sources and presents them in a single reference. Data sources drawn upon include the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for crash data, Department of Justice (DOJ) for arrest data, and the DMV driver record database. Each of these reporting agencies, however, initially draw their data from diffuse primary sources such as individual law enforcement agencies (arrest and crash reports) and the courts (abstracts of conviction).

The general conceptual design of the California DUI management information system (DUI-MIS) is presented in Figure 1. The basic theme of the DUI-MIS is to track the processing of offenders through the DUI system from the point of arrest and to identify the frequency with which offenders flow through each branch of the system process (from law enforcement through adjudication to treatment and license control actions). Figure 1 also illustrates the relationship between offender flow and data collection at each point of the process. The initiating data source for the DUI-MIS is the DUI arrest report, as compiled by the DOJ, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system.

Another major objective of this report is to evaluate the effectiveness of court and administrative sanctions on convicted DUI offenders. In the earlier years of this report, these evaluations were accomplished by examining the postconviction recidivism records (alcohol/drug-related crashes and traffic convictions) of offenders assigned to alternative sanctions within offender group. In recent years as the sanctions became increasingly homogenous within each offender group, the evaluations (as mandated by law) became focused on available sanctions in selected groups. These evaluations are detailed in Section 4 on "Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness."

*Figure 1. DUI management information system.*



It should again be noted that it is not an objective of this report to make recommendations based on the data presented. Rather, the primary purpose of a reporting system such as the DUI-MIS is to provide objective data on the operating and performance characteristics of the system for others to assess in making policy decisions, formulating improvements and conducting more in-depth evaluations.

The DUI-MIS data system and report has led to numerous improvements in the California DUI system, from the identification of inappropriate dismissals in a small central valley court to major initiatives to improve the tracking and reporting of DUI cases. The success of the California DUI-MIS has also contributed to a national initiative to design a model DUI reporting system, developed under contract to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).



## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS

The information presented below on DUI arrests is based primarily on data collected annually by the Department of Justice (DOJ), Criminal Justice Statistics Center, Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system. These data are the most current nonaggregated data available on DUI arrests.

Table 1: DUI Arrests by County and Annual Percentage Change from 2005-2007. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2005-2007 and the percentage change from 2006-2007 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2007 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2007 DUI arrests by felony, juvenile, and misdemeanor arrest type, by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2007 DUI Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a cross tabulates age by sex and age by race/ethnicity of 2007 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Also, Table 3a shows the average (mean) age for 2007 arrestees. In addition to the mean, the median (midpoint) was reported to minimize the influence of data values that are not equally distributed. Table 3b shows the same data cross tabulated by sex and age within race/ethnicity.

Table 3c: DUI Arrests Under Age 21, 1997-2007. Table 3c shows a breakdown of DUI arrests under 21, by age, from 1997 to 2007. It also shows the proportion of DUI arrests under 21 in the total number of DUI arrests for the state over the same time period.

Figure 2 displays the trend in DUI arrests from 1997 to 2007.

Figure 3 shows the percentage of 2007 DUI arrests and 2007 projected population by race/ethnicity.




Figure 2. DUI arrests 1997-2007.

Based on the data shown in Figures 2 and 3 and previously listed tables, the following statements can be made about DUI arrests in California:

Statewide Parameters:

- DUI arrests increased by 3.4% in 2007, following an increase of 9.4% in 2006, and a decrease of 0.4% in 2005 (see Table 1).
- Table 2 shows that the DUI arrest rate per 100 licensed drivers was 0.9 in 2007, up from 0.8 in 2000-2006. This represents a 50% reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
- The percentage of DUI arrests that were felonies (involving bodily injury or death) decreased slightly from 3.1% in 2006 to 3.0% in 2007. Felony DUI arrests continue to constitute a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).
- County Variation:
- 20.3% of all 2007 California DUI arrests occurred in Los Angeles County. Five counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside) had over 10,000 DUI arrests each, accounting for 48.3% of all arrests (see Table 2).
- The 2007 county DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.3 to 2.9 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers (the statewide average rate is 0.9). Five counties had rates of 0.7 or below. These low arrest rate counties were San Francisco (0.3), Contra Costa (0.6), Santa

Clara (0.6), Los Angeles (0.7), and San Mateo (0.7). Five counties had rates of 2.0 or higher—Glenn (2.9), Sierra (2.5), Tehama (2.3), Colusa (2.1), and Inyo (2.0). This is shown in Table 2.

- Many counties showed an increase in DUI arrests in 2007. Among the larger counties, the greatest percentage increase occurred in San Bernardino (11.1%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage increases in DUI arrests occurred in Shasta (40.8%), Humboldt (26.7%), and Tehama (25.0%). Counties showing the largest percentage declines in DUI arrests were Lassen (-17.2%), Sierra (-15.0%), and Kings (-14.7%). This is shown in Table 1.
- Demographic Characteristics:
- The median age of a DUI arrestee in 2007 was 30 years. Slightly more than half (52.7%) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters (74.6%) were age 40 or younger. Less than 1% of all DUI arrests involved juveniles (under age 18). 2.2% of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).
- Among all DUI arrestees, the proportion of DUI arrests under age 18 has remained relatively stable in the past 10 years (varying between 0.8% and 0.9%); however, the proportion of DUI arrests under age 21 increased from 7.3% in 1997 to 9.2% in 2007 (26.0% increase). This is shown in Table 3c.
- Males comprised 81.2% of all 2007 DUI arrests (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen slightly each year this report has been produced, from 10.6% in 1989 to 18.8% in 2007.
- In 2007, Hispanics (45.9%) again represented the largest ethnic group among DUI arrestees as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999, when Whites were the largest group at 42.8%). Hispanics continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2007 population parity of 35.8% (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also slightly overrepresented among DUI arrestees (7.2% of arrests, 6.0% of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2007 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites (39.9% of arrests, 43.4% of the population),

and "Other" (7.0% of arrests, 14.8% of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.

- Among male 2007 DUI arrestees, 50.5% were Hispanic, 35.7% were White, 7.0% were Black, and 6.8% were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, 58.2% were White, 25.8% were Hispanic, 7.9% were Black, and 8.1% were "Other." The overrepresentation of Hispanics among DUI offenders is clearly limited to males (see Table 3b).
- In some counties where the population of Hispanics is high, the DUI arrest rate is also high. For example, in the following eight counties, Hispanics comprised 60% or more of those arrested for DUI during 2007: Tulare (76.6%), San Benito (70.2%), Imperial (69.5%), Merced (67.4%), Monterey (67.0%), Fresno (66.8%), Madera (63.2%), and Kings (61.2%). However, in most other counties, the majority of arrestees were White (see Appendix Table B1).
- The median age of a DUI arrestee varied considerably by race: Blacks were the oldest with a median age of 33.0 years, while Hispanics were the youngest, with a median age of 28.0 years (see Table 3a).




Figure 3. Percentage of 2007 DUI arrests and 2007 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS\* BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2005-2007

COUNTY	2005	2006	2007	% CHANGE 2006-2007
STATEWIDE	180288	197248	203866	3.4
ALAMEDA	7241	7253	7518	3.7
ALPINE	27	22	19	-13.6
AMADOR	310	352	345	-2.0
BUTTE	1432	1647	1938	17.7
CALAVERAS	313	319	360	12.9
COLUSA	294	268	283	5.6
CONTRA COSTA	3494	4004	4314	7.7
DEL NORTE	327	272	308	13.2
EL DORADO	1370	1411	1235	-12.5
FRESNO	6388	7826	7713	-1.4
GLENN	589	512	539	5.3
HUMBOLDT	1240	1164	1475	26.7
IMPERIAL	1181	1371	1401	2.2
INYO	218	334	295	-11.7
KERN	5105	5232	5606	7.1
KINGS	992	1297	1106	-14.7
LAKE	476	535	517	-3.4
LASSEN	244	262	217	-17.2
LOS ANGELES	38329	39518	41286	4.5
MADERA	1016	1104	1043	-5.5
MARIN	1557	1583	1633	3.2
MARIPOSA	130	161	153	-5.0
MENDOCINO	759	1087	1019	-6.3
MERCED	1753	1988	2046	2.9
MODOC	72	98	93	-5.1
MONO	125	149	167	12.1
MONTEREY	2973	3052	3046	-0.2
NAPA	981	1056	1127	6.7
NEVADA	664	758	791	4.4
ORANGE	13586	16012	16492	3.0
PLACER	1834	2351	2257	-4.0
PLUMAS	221	262	274	4.6
RIVERSIDE	8754	9896	10252	3.6
SACRAMENTO	7172	7818	8014	2.5
SAN BENITO	377	396	423	6.8
SAN BERNARDINO	10810	12233	13586	11.1
SAN DIEGO	16467	18101	16848	-6.9
SAN FRANCISCO	1363	1336	1405	5.2
SAN JOAQUIN	3955	4436	4168	-6.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2267	2549	2432	-4.6
SAN MATEO	3310	3542	3447	-2.7
SANTA BARBARA	2518	2665	2784	4.5
SANTA CLARA	6619	6697	6968	4.0
SANTA CRUZ	1605	1739	1920	10.4
SHASTA	891	1276	1796	40.8
SIERRA	83	80	68	-15.0
SISKIYOU	365	447	475	6.3
SOLANO	1746	1916	2176	13.6
SONOMA	2985	3384	3455	2.1
STANISLAUS	2660	2846	3316	16.5
SUTTER	473	584	583	-0.2
TEHAMA	718	748	935	25.0
TRINITY	169	190	180	-5.3
TULARE	3315	3476	4115	18.4
TUOLUMNE	453	463	524	13.2
VENTURA	4139	5196	5410	4.1
YOLO	1273	1293	1221	-5.6
YUBA	560	681	749	10.0

\*DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI (N = 278) removed.

TABLE 2: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL		TYPE OF ARREST						DUI ARRESTS PER 100 LICENSED DRIVERS
			FELONY		JUVENILE		MISDEMEANOR		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STATEWIDE	203866	100.0	6192	3.0	1635	0.8	196039	96.2	0.9
ALAMEDA	7518	3.7	100	1.3	35	0.5	7383	98.2	0.8
ALPINE	19	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	18	94.7	1.7
AMADOR	345	0.2	13	3.8	3	0.9	329	95.4	1.2
BUTTE	1938	1.0	50	2.6	35	1.8	1853	95.6	1.3
CALAVERAS	360	0.2	16	4.4	4	1.1	340	94.4	1.0
COLUSA	283	0.1	4	1.4	3	1.1	276	97.5	2.1
CONTRA COSTA	4314	2.1	107	2.5	54	1.3	4153	96.3	0.6
DEL NORTE	308	0.2	7	2.3	1	0.3	300	97.4	1.7
EL DORADO	1235	0.6	53	4.3	17	1.4	1165	94.3	0.9
FRESNO	7713	3.8	234	3.0	62	0.8	7417	96.2	1.5
GLENN	539	0.3	8	1.5	5	0.9	526	97.6	2.9
HUMBOLDT	1475	0.7	37	2.5	13	0.9	1425	96.6	1.5
IMPERIAL	1401	0.7	26	1.9	11	0.8	1364	97.4	1.4
INYO	295	0.1	8	2.7	2	0.7	285	96.6	2.0
KERN	5606	2.7	181	3.2	54	1.0	5371	95.8	1.2
KINGS	1106	0.5	32	2.9	12	1.1	1062	96.0	1.6
LAKE	517	0.3	16	3.1	8	1.5	493	95.4	1.1
LASSEN	217	0.1	4	1.8	5	2.3	208	95.9	1.1
LOS ANGELES	41286	20.3	1703	4.1	153	0.4	39430	95.5	0.7
MADERA	1043	0.5	41	3.9	14	1.3	988	94.7	1.3
MARIN	1633	0.8	23	1.4	13	0.8	1597	97.8	0.9
MARIPOSA	153	0.1	5	3.3	1	0.7	147	96.1	1.0
MENDOCINO	1019	0.5	25	2.5	14	1.4	980	96.2	1.6
MERCED	2046	1.0	64	3.1	22	1.1	1960	95.8	1.5
MODOC	93	0.0	3	3.2	0	0.0	90	96.8	1.4
MONO	167	0.1	4	2.4	1	0.6	162	97.0	1.7
MONTEREY	3046	1.5	64	2.1	21	0.7	2961	97.2	1.3
NAPA	1127	0.6	34	3.0	15	1.3	1078	95.7	1.2
NEVADA	791	0.4	20	2.5	8	1.0	763	96.5	1.0
ORANGE	16492	8.1	306	1.9	119	0.7	16067	97.4	0.8
PLACER	2257	1.1	55	2.4	31	1.4	2171	96.2	0.9
PLUMAS	274	0.1	7	2.6	1	0.4	266	97.1	1.5
RIVERSIDE	10252	5.0	263	2.6	82	0.8	9907	96.6	0.8
SACRAMENTO	8014	3.9	335	4.2	48	0.6	7631	95.2	0.9
SAN BENITO	423	0.2	12	2.8	8	1.9	403	95.3	1.2
SAN BERNARDINO	13586	6.7	433	3.2	116	0.9	13037	96.0	1.1
SAN DIEGO	16848	8.3	471	2.8	153	0.9	16224	96.3	0.8
SAN FRANCISCO	1405	0.7	81	5.8	4	0.3	1320	94.0	0.3
SAN JOAQUIN	4168	2.0	101	2.4	32	0.8	4035	96.8	1.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2432	1.2	66	2.7	38	1.6	2328	95.7	1.3
SAN MATEO	3447	1.7	64	1.9	29	0.8	3354	97.3	0.7
SANTA BARBARA	2784	1.4	94	3.4	24	0.9	2666	95.8	1.0
SANTA CLARA	6968	3.4	278	4.0	61	0.9	6629	95.1	0.6
SANTA CRUZ	1920	0.9	34	1.8	27	1.4	1859	96.8	1.1
SHASTA	1796	0.9	53	3.0	26	1.4	1717	95.6	1.3
SIERRA	68	0.0	8	11.8	1	1.5	59	86.8	2.5
SISKIYOU	475	0.2	8	1.7	3	0.6	464	97.7	1.3
SOLANO	2176	1.1	61	2.8	37	1.7	2078	95.5	0.8
SONOMA	3455	1.7	52	1.5	31	0.9	3372	97.6	1.0
STANISLAUS	3316	1.6	115	3.5	32	1.0	3169	95.6	1.1
SUTTER	583	0.3	20	3.4	5	0.9	558	95.7	1.0
TEHAMA	935	0.5	27	2.9	7	0.7	901	96.4	2.3
TRINITY	180	0.1	7	3.9	3	1.7	170	94.4	1.7
TULARE	4115	2.0	112	2.7	44	1.1	3959	96.2	1.8
TUOLUMNE	524	0.3	14	2.7	1	0.2	509	97.1	1.2
VENTURA	5410	2.7	181	3.3	64	1.2	5165	95.5	1.0
YOLO	1221	0.6	30	2.5	21	1.7	1170	95.8	1.0
YUBA	749	0.4	21	2.8	1	0.1	727	97.1	1.7

TABLE 3a: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY\*

AGE	TOTAL		SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	203866	100.0	165439	81.2	38427	18.8	81435	39.9	93474	45.9	14627	7.2	14330	7.0
UNDER 18	1635	0.8	1237	75.7	398	24.3	926	56.6	584	35.7	45	2.8	80	4.9
18-20	17201	8.4	13998	81.4	3203	18.6	7005	40.7	8237	47.9	766	4.5	1193	6.9
21-30	88755	43.5	72157	81.3	16598	18.7	31304	35.3	45095	50.8	5359	6.0	6997	7.9
31-40	44668	21.9	36990	82.8	7678	17.2	15138	33.9	22745	50.9	3692	8.3	3093	6.9
41-50	32772	16.1	25703	78.4	7069	21.6	15765	48.1	12089	36.9	3077	9.4	1841	5.6
51-60	14413	7.1	11701	81.2	2712	18.8	8443	58.6	3805	26.4	1289	8.9	876	6.1
61-70	3608	1.8	2965	82.2	643	17.8	2295	63.6	773	21.4	325	9.0	215	6.0
71 & ABOVE	814	0.4	688	84.5	126	15.5	559	68.7	146	17.9	74	9.1	35	4.3
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	32.9		32.9		33.0		34.7		31.0		35.4		31.7	
MEDIAN AGE (YEARS)	30.0		30.0		29.0		31.0		28.0		33.0		28.0	

\*Tabulations for DUI arrests by age, sex, race/ethnicity and county are found in Appendix Table B1.

TABLE 3b: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

SEX	AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
				WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		203866	100.0	81435	39.9	93474	45.9	14627	7.2	14330	7.0
MALE	UNDER 18	1237	0.7	623	50.4	513	41.5	41	3.3	60	4.9
	18-20	13998	8.5	5191	37.1	7289	52.1	609	4.4	909	6.5
	21-30	72157	43.6	22669	31.4	40036	55.5	4179	5.8	5273	7.3
	31-40	36990	22.4	10942	29.6	20614	55.7	2943	8.0	2491	6.7
	41-50	25703	15.5	10979	42.7	10797	42.0	2421	9.4	1506	5.9
	51-60	11701	7.1	6429	54.9	3463	29.6	1061	9.1	748	6.4
	61-70	2965	1.8	1771	59.7	705	23.8	285	9.6	204	6.9
	71 & ABOVE	688	0.4	451	65.6	136	19.8	69	10.0	32	4.7
	TOTAL	165439	100.0	59055	35.7	83553	50.5	11608	7.0	11223	6.8
FEMALE	UNDER 18	398	1.0	303	76.1	71	17.8	4	1.0	20	5.0
	18-20	3203	8.3	1814	56.6	948	29.6	157	4.9	284	8.9
	21-30	16598	43.2	8635	52.0	5059	30.5	1180	7.1	1724	10.4
	31-40	7678	20.0	4196	54.6	2131	27.8	749	9.8	602	7.8
	41-50	7069	18.4	4786	67.7	1292	18.3	656	9.3	335	4.7
	51-60	2712	7.1	2014	74.3	342	12.6	228	8.4	128	4.7
	61-70	643	1.7	524	81.5	68	10.6	40	6.2	11	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	126	0.3	108	85.7	10	7.9	5	4.0	3	2.4
	TOTAL	38427	100.0	22380	58.2	9921	25.8	3019	7.9	3107	8.1

TABLE 3c: DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 1997-2007

AGE		1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
TOTAL (ALL AGES)	N	191164	188327	188523	181336	176490	177056	183560	180957	180288	197248	203866
UNDER 18	N	1709	1761	1741	1527	1645	1557	1576	1488	1436	1697	1635
	%	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8
18-20	N	12267	13093	13875	14145	14075	14410	14612	14672	14617	16837	17201
	%	6.4	7.0	7.4	7.8	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.1	8.1	8.5	8.4
UNDER 21	N	13976	14854	15616	15672	15720	15967	16188	16160	16053	18534	18836
	%	7.3	7.9	8.3	8.6	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.9	8.9	9.4	9.2



## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of DUI arrests are reported directly to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Although the DUI arrest data reported earlier are based on arrests that occurred in 2007, the DUI conviction data are based on convictions of DUI offenders arrested in 2006, in order to allow sufficient time for courts to report convictions to DMV. The following tables compile and cross tabulate these conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. Beginning with the 2007 DUI-MIS report, the median was calculated and reported to describe certain characteristics of the conviction data, in addition to the mean, to minimize the influence of data values that are not symmetrically distributed. In what follows, expressions like “2006 convictions” refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2006, and subsequently convicted.

Table 4: 2006 DUI Convictions by Age and Sex. This table cross tabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and sex. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 5: Matchable 2006 DUI Convictions by Age, Race/Ethnicity, and Sex. This table displays DUI conviction information by age, race/ethnicity, and sex. "Matchable" DUI convictions are those which are traceable to a DUI arrest appearing on the MACR system. Because not all arrests could be matched to an existing record, these conviction totals underestimate the total number of actual convictions.

Table 6: Adjusted 2006 DUI Conviction Rates and Relative Likelihood of Conviction by Age and Race/Ethnicity. This table shows the relative probability of a DUI arrest leading to a DUI conviction by age and race/ethnicity. DUI conviction rates for each age and race/ethnicity group in this table were proportionally adjusted to the overall conviction rate to avoid the underestimate that would result from the “matchable DUI convictions” data reported in Table 5 (not all reported convictions are "matchable" to an arrest).

Table 7: Total Conviction Data for 2006 DUI Arrests. This table portrays county and statewide DUI-related conviction data as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Corresponding court-specific data are shown in Appendix Table B3. Convictions not reported to DMV are considered nonconvictions for the purposes of this report. Actual nonconvictions include cases where the DUI arrest was not filed, not


prosecuted, or resulted in a not-guilty verdict. The DUI conviction rates by county were calculated by comparing the county conviction totals with DOJ arrest totals. Because not all 2006 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these conviction totals and rates will slightly underestimate the "final" figures. The DUI conviction rates shown in the "DUI Summary Statistics: 1997-2007" table at the very beginning of this report include an estimate of these late convictions, and thus are slightly higher than those shown in Tables 7 and 8. Conviction variables include felony and misdemeanor DUI convictions, alcohol- and nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions, convictions of "other" lesser offenses, and DUI convictions dismissed or found unconstitutional. DUI arrest dates from the DOJ MACR system were matched to driver record violation dates to identify nonalcohol-related reckless driving and "other" convictions. The median adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, were calculated for each county.

Table 8: Adjudication Status of 2006 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows the adjudication status (court disposition) of 2006 DUI arrests, by county. Included are the percentages of arrests which resulted in DUI convictions (misdemeanor or felony), reckless driving convictions (alcohol-related or nonalcohol-related), convictions of "other" offenses, or no reported conviction, as of the date of writing. Again, because not all 2006 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these rates will slightly underestimate the "final" rate for each category, except for the category "no record of any conviction," which will be slightly reduced (approximately 1-2%) by the eventual adjudication of these few late cases.

Table 9a: 2006 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI Convictions and Table 9b: 2006 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Convicted DUI Offenders Under Age 21. Table 9a shows the frequency of reported positive BAC levels for DUI and alcohol-reckless convictions. Because the forms on which APS actions are reported more completely report BAC levels (82.4%) than do abstracts of conviction, APS forms are used to calculate statewide BAC levels. Table 9b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21.

Table 10: 2006 DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Reported BAC Level. This table displays the proportions of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in ten years as defined by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective 1/1/2005), with the average (mean) and median BAC level from APS reporting forms and abstracts of conviction, for each offense level.

Figure 4 (below) shows, for the years 1997 to 2007, the number of DUI abstracts of conviction received to date by DMV from the courts, and conviction rates based on the data received as of September 2008.



Percent convicted of DUI as of Sept. 2008 (conviction rate)	75%	77%	79%	80%	80%	79%	79%	80%	80%	79%	75%
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

*Note:* For arrests occurring from 1997 to 2006, 5.3% of California drivers had one or more DUI convictions on their record in 2006.

*Figure 4.* DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV and conviction rates, 1997-2007.

Based on these data, the following statements can be made:

Statewide Adjudication Parameters:

- 79.4% of 2006 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of DUI offenses (see Table 7).
- As of January 1, 2005, DUI convictions remain on the driving record for ten years. Therefore, based on the DUI conviction data, over ten years (1997-2006), 5.3% of California drivers have one or more DUI convictions on their record.
- 9.4% of 2006 DUI arrests resulted in reckless driving convictions, and 16.0% (1.5%/9.4%) of these were nonalcohol-related reckless violations (see Table 8).

- 1.8% of 2006 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, which is slightly lower than last year (see Table 8).
- 9.4% of 2006 DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction on DMV's records, down slightly from 10.3% last year, and down from 16.3% in 1995. As additional cases are adjudicated and reported by the courts, this figure will decrease slightly (see Table 8).
- The average reported BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders in 2006, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was 0.16% (median BAC level was 0.15%), which is the same as last year, yet still double the illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08% (see Table 9a).
- Average and median BAC levels increase as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions. The average BAC level increases from a 0.16% BAC for a first offense to a 0.19% BAC for a fourth-or-subsequent offense (when the median is reported, BAC level increases from a 0.15% BAC for a first offense to a 0.18% BAC for a fourth-or-subsequent offense). This is shown in Table 10.
- Among 2006 convicted DUI offenders, 73.5% were first offenders, 19.7% were second offenders, 5.1% were third offenders, and 1.7% were on their fourth-or-more offense. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors in California has traditionally been 7 years, although that period was just changed to 10 years by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective 1/1/2005.) The proportion of all convicted DUI offenders that are repeat offenders (26.5%), shown in Table 10, has increased ever since the counting period for priors has changed from seven to ten years.
- The median adjudication time lags were 77 days from DUI arrest to conviction and 11 days from conviction to update on the DMV database, totaling a little less than 3 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record. This total elapsed time from arrest to update appears substantially shorter in the last three annual reports, ever since elapsed time for conviction data reported here was calculated using the median instead of the mean (see Table 7).
- Variation by County:
- Among the larger counties, 2006 DUI conviction rates varied from highs of 89.7% in Orange to a low of 70.6% in Fresno. Los Angeles County, which accounted for about 20 percent of all DUI arrests in the state, had a DUI conviction rate of 74.6% (see Table 7).

- Among the smaller counties, 2006 DUI conviction rates varied from a high of 99.2% in Placer to a low of 32.5% in Sierra (see Table 7).
- The rates at which DUI arrests were plea-bargained to alcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 25.1% in Mendocino County to 0% in Marin and Ventura County (see Table 8).
- The percentage of DUI arrests that were improperly adjudicated as nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 0% (Trinity) to 10.3% (San Francisco). This is shown in Table 8.
- The percentage of DUI arrests adjudicated as minor convictions ("other" convictions) varied from 0% to 5.5%. Del Norte, Los Angeles, Modoc, and San Luis Obispo counties had rates of 3% or more (see Table 8).
- In five counties, the proportion of arrests not showing a conviction of any offense was 30% or more. These counties were Imperial, Mariposa, Sierra, Tehama, and Trinity. Twenty one counties had nonconviction rates of less than 10%, (10 counties did not have complete data). This is shown in Table 8.
- Variation by Court:
- Court time lags from arrest to conviction (for courts with more than 200 reported convictions) varied from a high of 206 days in the Chowchilla court (Madera County) to a low of 25 days for the Lamont (Kern County) court (see Table B3 in Appendix).
- Statewide, the proportion of DUI arrests resulting in reckless driving convictions (alcohol- and nonalcohol-related) was 9.4% in 2006. Twelve counties adjudicated 20% or more of their DUI arrests as reckless driving convictions (see Table 8).
- Statewide, 16.0% (1.5%/9.4%) of all DUI-related reckless driving convictions in 2006 were inappropriately designated as nonalcohol, slightly down from 16.7% in 2005, and 17.2% in 2004 (see Table 8).
- Demographic Characteristics:
- The median age of a convicted DUI offender in 2006 was 30.0 years (see Table 4).
- 51.7% of 2006 DUI convictees were 30 years of age or younger and 74.4% were 40 years or younger (see Table 4).

- Females comprised 18.2% of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2006 (see Table 4). The proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994.
- The racial/ethnic distribution of 2006 DUI convictions (White = 42.5%; Hispanic = 44.0%; Black = 6.6%; “Other” = 6.8%, see Table 5) generally paralleled that of 2006 arrests, although Whites were somewhat more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to be convicted of the offense (as shown in Figure 5 and Table 6 below).




Figure 5. Relative likelihood of conviction by race/ethnicity. (Adjusted conviction rate of ethnicity ÷ overall conviction rate.)

TABLE 4: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX\*

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	156595	100.0	128086	81.8	28509	18.2
UNDER 18	811	0.5	688	84.8	123	15.2
18-20	12823	8.2	10456	81.5	2367	18.5
21-30	67370	43.0	55433	82.3	11937	17.7
31-40	35545	22.7	29556	83.2	5989	16.8
41-50	25854	16.5	20236	78.3	5618	21.7
51-60	10999	7.0	9022	82.0	1977	18.0
61-70	2591	1.7	2191	84.6	400	15.4
71 & ABOVE	602	0.4	504	83.7	98	16.3
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	33.0		33.0		33.3	
MEDIAN AGE (YEARS)	30.0		30.0		30.0	

\*County-specific tabulations of 2006 DUI convictions by age and sex are shown in Appendix Table B2.

TABLE 5: MATCHABLE 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX\*

AGE	TOTAL	RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)											
		WHITE				HISPANIC				BLACK			
		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	133027	100.0				41273	31.0	15350	11.5	52544	39.5	5983	4.5
										6992	5.3	1773	1.3
UNDER 18	687	0.5				258	37.6	102	14.8	255	37.1	27	3.9
18-20	11134	8.4				3569	32.1	1290	11.6	4627	41.6	586	5.3
21-30	57357	43.1				16162	28.2	5939	10.4	24740	43.1	2993	5.2
31-40	29699	22.3				7909	26.6	2991	10.1	13119	44.2	1326	4.5
41-50	22008	16.5				7847	35.7	3388	15.4	6830	31.0	801	3.6
51-60	9371	7.0				4084	43.6	1279	13.6	2414	25.8	219	2.3
61-70	2252	1.7				1156	51.3	282	12.5	468	20.8	23	1.0
71 & ABOVE	519	0.4				288	55.5	79	15.2	91	17.5	8	1.5
										34	6.6	2	0.4

\*Not all convictions are matchable to an existing record, so these counts underestimate the total number of convictions.

TABLE 6: ADJUSTED 2006 DUI CONVICTION RATES<sup>1</sup> AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD<sup>2</sup> OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY

AGE	TOTAL	RACE/ETHNICITY													
		WHITE				HISPANIC				BLACK				OTHER	
		ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD		
STATEWIDE		0.79	1.00	0.84	1.05	0.76	0.96	0.75	0.95	0.79	1.00				
UNDER 18		0.48	0.60	0.49	0.61	0.48	0.61	0.35	0.44	0.40	0.50				
18-20		0.78	0.98	0.82	1.03	0.75	0.95	0.69	0.86	0.78	0.98				
21-30		0.79	1.00	0.86	1.08	0.75	0.95	0.76	0.95	0.77	0.97				
31-40		0.79	1.00	0.84	1.06	0.76	0.96	0.76	0.96	0.81	1.01				
41-50		0.82	1.03	0.84	1.05	0.81	1.02	0.76	0.95	0.84	1.05				
51-60		0.81	1.02	0.81	1.02	0.83	1.04	0.74	0.93	0.82	1.03				
61-70		0.80	1.01	0.80	1.00	0.83	1.04	0.75	0.94	0.81	1.03				
71 & ABOVE		0.77	0.97	0.76	0.96	0.85	1.07	0.77	0.97	0.63	0.79				

<sup>1</sup>Adjusted DUI Conviction Rates = The matchable DUI conviction rate proportionally adjusted to the overall DUI conviction rate.<sup>2</sup>Relative Likelihood = Adjusted DUI Conviction Rate/Overall Total DUI Conviction Rate.

TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	MEDIAN <sup>4</sup> DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	79.4	152059	4536	15563	2985	3497	1297	77.0	11.0
ALAMEDA	73.5	5285	48	784	117	161	66	105.0	6.0
ALPINE	68.2	13	2	5	1	0	0	57.0	8.0
AMADOR	82.4	281	9	45	13	2	2	72.0	4.0
BUTTE	80.4	1275	50	256	88	24	23	73.0	20.0
CALAVERAS	70.2	215	9	58	8	6	6	55.0	20.0
COLUSA	75.0	192	9	30	11	4	5	62.0	9.0
CONTRA COSTA	82.9	3225	95	440	4	47	53	146.0	9.0
DEL NORTE	52.9	139	5	58	2	15	4	70.0	22.0
EL DORADO	76.0	1026	46	185	32	9	17	90.0	11.0
FRESNO	70.6	5284	243	653	71	63	43	107.0	45.0
GLENN	63.3	318	6	56	8	15	5	53.0	10.0
HUMBOLDT	56.4	628	28	204	39	29	1	87.0	14.0
IMPERIAL	59.2	798	13	30	74	10	23	141.0	79.0
INYO	71.0	225	12	51	1	5	1	60.0	5.0
KERN	81.6	4157	113	436	106	65	59	34.0	21.0
KINGS	74.9	935	36	101	38	11	7	82.0	0.0
LAKE	77.9	399	18	45	14	9	12	135.0	30.0
LASSEN	81.7	211	3	9	11	7	4	119.0	38.0
LOS ANGELES	74.6	28989	488	2946	439	1573	145	67.0	13.0
MADERA	65.6	690	34	90	14	10	11	188.0	19.0
MARIN	86.9	1353	23	0	3	37	8	59.0	23.0
MARIPOSA <sup>5</sup>	47.9	98	4	34	9	4	5	59.0	11.0
MENDOCINO	89.3	939	32	273	21	11	25	41.0	70.0
MERCED	74.1	1446	27	156	23	25	36	102.0	88.0
MODOC	77.6	75	1	5	4	3	3	65.0	21.0
MONO	87.2	127	3	9	3	1	2	72.0	14.0
MONTEREY	80.7	2411	53	231	105	32	18	50.0	14.0

<sup>1</sup> Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3.<sup>2</sup> This count includes misdemeanors which carried a felony disposition code. These counts do not include 4th offenses (in ten years) which are statutorily defined as felonies.<sup>3</sup> These dismissals were identified in DMV's DUI Audit and Tracking System Summary Report.<sup>4</sup> Adjudication time is presented using median values (in days) for 2006 data.<sup>5</sup> The calculation of the conviction rate was based on total arrests including federal DUI arrests in Yosemite National Park not reported in the DOJ MACR system.



TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS<sup>1</sup> - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	MEDIAN <sup>4</sup> DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)		
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE	
NAPA	87.9	891	37	107	3	5	6	56.0		2.0
NEVADA	79.2	582	18	159	22	11	14	54.0		46.0
ORANGE	89.7	13911	446	778	82	131	58	104.0		0.0
PLACER	99.2	2257	76	169	13	9	14	66.0		14.0
PLUMAS	80.9	208	4	52	11	1	0	51.0		22.0
RIVERSIDE	80.9	7775	233	137	296	76	39	75.0		1.0
SACRAMENTO	77.0	5757	262	669	21	84	16	50.0		15.0
SAN BENITO	88.1	334	15	39	7	5	3	58.0		14.0
SAN BERNARDINO	76.6	9007	365	313	275	332	126	114.0		20.0
SAN DIEGO	84.4	14805	468	1546	302	135	87	100.0		4.0
SAN FRANCISCO	69.8	911	21	139	137	12	58	79.0		13.0
SAN JOAQUIN	77.0	3292	125	389	56	46	21	108.0		5.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	81.7	2007	75	392	48	77	21	45.0		7.0
SAN MATEO	78.4	2732	45	457	25	62	42	94.0		8.0
SANTA BARBARA	92.0	2329	122	253	96	30	11	63.0		22.0
SANTA CLARA	87.3	5650	195	680	105	68	3	70.0		6.0
SANTA CRUZ	82.2	1389	40	207	23	18	2	80.0		34.0
SHASTA	96.9	1161	75	97	13	11	15	99.0		8.0
SIERRA	32.5	25	1	14	2	0	0	43.0		27.0
SISKIYOU	80.3	336	23	64	7	2	5	69.0		6.0
SOLANO	87.4	1637	37	231	25	23	30	93.0		37.0
SONOMA	77.5	2511	111	694	51	19	49	49.0		14.0
STANISLAUS	74.9	2096	36	185	36	22	10	75.0		34.0
SUTTER	76.4	424	22	92	3	3	6	55.0		31.0
TEHAMA	53.2	378	20	78	10	1	4	53.0		9.0
TRINITY	45.3	83	3	20	0	0	2	64.0		15.0
TULARE	77.8	2626	78	84	8	58	20	51.0		37.0
TUOLUMNE	86.8	390	12	62	14	3	1	49.0		6.0
VENTURA	86.4	4408	81	1	6	64	56	68.0		1.0
YOLO	80.3	978	60	161	26	9	7	94.0		34.0
YUBA	66.8	435	20	104	3	2	2	78.0		64.0

TABLE 8: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTIONS		RECKLESS DRIVING CONVICTIONS		% OTHER CONVICTIONS	% NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION <sup>2</sup>
	% MISDEMEANOR	% FELONY	% ALCOHOL RELATED	% NONALCOHOL RELATED		
STATEWIDE	77.1	2.3	7.9	1.5	1.8	9.4
ALAMEDA	72.9	0.7	10.8	1.6	2.2	11.8
ALPINE	59.1	9.1	22.7	4.5	0.0	4.5
AMADOR	79.8	2.6	12.8	3.7	0.6	0.6
BUTTE	77.4	3.0	15.5	5.3	1.5	N/A
CALAVERAS	67.4	2.8	18.2	2.5	1.9	7.2
COLUSA	71.6	3.4	11.2	4.1	1.5	8.2
CONTRA COSTA	80.5	2.4	11.0	0.1	1.2	4.8
DEL NORTE	51.1	1.8	21.3	0.7	5.5	19.5
EL DORADO	72.7	3.3	13.1	2.3	0.6	8.0
FRESNO	67.5	3.1	8.3	0.9	0.8	19.3
GLENN	62.1	1.2	10.9	1.6	2.9	21.3
HUMBOLDT	54.0	2.4	17.5	3.4	2.5	20.3
IMPERIAL	58.2	0.9	2.2	5.4	0.7	32.5
INYO	67.4	3.6	15.3	0.3	1.5	12.0
KERN	79.5	2.2	8.3	2.0	1.2	6.8
KINGS	72.1	2.8	7.8	2.9	0.8	13.6
LAKE	74.6	3.4	8.4	2.6	1.7	9.3
LASSEN	80.5	1.1	3.4	4.2	2.7	8.0
LOS ANGELES	73.4	1.2	7.5	1.1	4.0	12.9
MADERA	62.5	3.1	8.2	1.3	0.9	24.1
MARIN	85.5	1.5	0.0	0.2	2.3	10.5
MARIPOSA <sup>3</sup>	46.0	1.9	16.0	4.2	1.9	30.0
MENDOCINO	86.4	2.9	25.1	1.9	1.0	N/A
MERCED	72.7	1.4	7.8	1.2	1.3	15.6
MODOC	76.5	1.0	5.1	4.1	3.1	10.2
MONO	85.2	2.0	6.0	2.0	0.7	4.0
MONTEREY	79.0	1.7	7.6	3.4	1.0	7.2
NAPA	84.4	3.5	10.1	0.3	0.5	1.2
NEVADA	76.8	2.4	21.0	2.9	1.5	N/A
ORANGE	86.9	2.8	4.9	0.5	0.8	4.1
PLACER	96.0	3.2	7.2	0.6	0.4	N/A
PLUMAS	79.4	1.5	19.8	4.2	0.4	N/A
RIVERSIDE	78.6	2.4	1.4	3.0	0.8	13.9
SACRAMENTO	73.6	3.4	8.6	0.3	1.1	13.1
SAN BENITO	84.3	3.8	9.8	1.8	1.3	N/A
SAN BERNARDINO	73.6	3.0	2.6	2.2	2.7	15.9
SAN DIEGO	81.8	2.6	8.5	1.7	0.7	4.7
SAN FRANCISCO	68.2	1.6	10.4	10.3	0.9	8.7
SAN JOAQUIN	74.2	2.8	8.8	1.3	1.0	11.9
SAN LUIS OBISPO	78.7	2.9	15.4	1.9	3.0	N/A
SAN MATEO	77.1	1.3	12.9	0.7	1.8	6.2
SANTA BARBARA	87.4	4.6	9.5	3.6	1.1	N/A
SANTA CLARA	84.4	2.9	10.2	1.6	1.0	N/A
SANTA CRUZ	79.9	2.3	11.9	1.3	1.0	3.6
SHASTA	91.0	5.9	7.6	1.0	0.9	N/A
SIERRA	31.3	1.2	17.5	2.5	0.0	47.5
SISKIYOU	75.2	5.1	14.3	1.6	0.4	3.4
SOLANO	85.4	1.9	12.1	1.3	1.2	N/A
SONOMA	74.2	3.3	20.5	1.5	0.6	N/A
STANISLAUS	73.6	1.3	6.5	1.3	0.8	16.5
SUTTER	72.6	3.8	15.8	0.5	0.5	6.8
TEHAMA	50.5	2.7	10.4	1.3	0.1	34.9
TRINITY	43.7	1.6	10.5	0.0	0.0	44.2
TULARE	75.5	2.2	2.4	0.2	1.7	17.9
TUOLUMNE	84.2	2.6	13.4	3.0	0.6	N/A
VENTURA	84.8	1.6	0.0	0.1	1.2	12.2
YOLO	75.6	4.6	12.5	2.0	0.7	4.6
YUBA	63.9	2.9	15.3	0.4	0.3	17.2

<sup>1</sup>The percentages total to 100 by row (county).<sup>2</sup>These include failure-to-appear (FTA) notices; the statewide average is 4.3%.<sup>3</sup>The calculation of the conviction rates was based on total arrests including federal DUI arrests (Yosemite National Park) not reported in the DOJ MACR system.

N/A - These counties had more total convictions than arrests, which could be due to arrests occurring in a different county from the county of conviction, or due to underreported arrests by arresting agencies, or underreported arrests by federal agencies (reporting not required by the DOJ MACR system).

TABLE 9a: 2006 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION  
(BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS

DUI CONVICTIONS			ALCOHOL-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS		
BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	1794	1.4	.00	315	2.6
.01	71	0.1	.01	19	0.2
.02	76	0.1	.02	20	0.2
.03	90	0.1	.03	23	0.2
.04	112	0.1	.04	51	0.4
.05	194	0.2	.05	74	0.6
.06	319	0.3	.06	237	1.9
.07	608	0.4	.07	802	6.5
.08	2541	2.0	.08	3073	25.0
.09	4533	3.5	.09	3405	27.7
.10	7471	5.8	.10	2003	16.3
.11	9190	7.1	.11	819	6.7
.12	9901	7.7	.12	402	3.3
.13	10098	7.8	.13	269	2.2
.14	9773	7.6	.14	201	1.6
.15	9787	7.6	.15	147	1.2
.16	9247	7.2	.16	111	0.9
.17	8472	6.6	.17	60	0.5
.18	7688	6.0	.18	60	0.5
.19	6809	5.3	.19	50	0.4
.20	5911	4.6	.20	27	0.2
.21	5003	3.9	.21	31	0.3
.22	4084	3.2	.22	22	0.2
.23	3218	2.5	.23	17	0.1
.24	2705	2.1	.24	9	0.1
.25	2190	1.7	.25	14	0.1
.26	1588	1.2	.26	8	0.1
.27	1279	1.0	.27	5	0.0
.28	953	0.7	.28	9	0.1
.29	772	0.6	.29	6	0.1
.30	615	0.5	.30	4	0.0
.31	461	0.4	.31	2	0.0
.32	343	0.3	.32	1	0.0
.33	283	0.2	.33	2	0.0
.34	209	0.2	.34	1	0.0
.35	163	0.1	.36	1	0.0
.36	113	0.1	.38	1	0.0
.37	102	0.1			
.38	79	0.1			
.39	48	0.0			
.40	42	0.0			
.41	37	0.0			
.42	16	0.0			
.43	3	0.0			
.44	10	0.0			
.45	10	0.0			
.46	6	0.0			
.47	5	0.0			
.48	6	0.0			
.50	1	0.0			
TOTAL	129029	100.0	TOTAL	12301	100.0
	MEAN** BAC .16			MEAN** BAC .10	
	MEDIAN** BAC .15			MEDIAN** BAC .09	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form, which replaced the abstract of conviction used in earlier reports. This change in data source was made because of the more complete BAC reporting on APS forms (82.4% of total).

\*\*The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 9b: 2006 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC)  
LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21

BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	179	1.8	.21	254	2.5
.01	17	0.2	.22	202	2.0
.02	14	0.1	.23	149	1.5
.03	21	0.2	.24	108	1.1
.04	27	0.3	.25	64	0.6
.05	64	0.6	.26	37	0.4
.06	104	1.0	.27	13	0.1
.07	151	1.5	.28	24	0.2
.08	389	3.8	.29	15	0.2
.09	570	5.6	.30	9	0.1
.10	793	7.8	.31	5	0.1
.11	935	9.2	.32	1	0.0
.12	974	9.5	.33	2	0.0
.13	928	9.1	.34	2	0.0
.14	817	8.0	.36	1	0.0
.15	827	8.1	.38	1	0.0
.16	673	6.6			
.17	606	5.9			
.18	503	4.9	TOTAL	10212	100.0
.19	405	4.0		MEAN** BAC .14	
.20	328	3.2		MEDIAN** BAC .14	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for arrested DUI offenders. The percentage of BAC levels found on these forms for 2006 convicted under age 21 cases is 74.9%.

\*\*The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 10: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS  
AND REPORTED BAC LEVEL

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	PERCENT	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%)	MEDIAN BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%)
STATEWIDE	100.0	.16	.15
1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	73.5	.16	.15
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19.7	.17	.16
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5.1	.18	.17
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1.7	.19	.18

### SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were obtained from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2006. The counts of postconviction court license actions are no longer included in this section due to a law change on September 20, 2005 (SB 1697, Torlakson), which gave DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions on DUI offenders. Since courts do not have the authority to impose license actions on DUI offenders anymore, the count of court license restrictions and suspensions, based on abstracts of DUI convictions, decreased dramatically. Therefore, beginning with this year's report, this section (Tables 11, 12, and Appendix Table B4) will no longer include information on postconviction license actions. Instead, the Administrative Action Section (Section 5) provides information on both APS license suspensions and revocations, and postconviction license actions. This section includes the following tables:


Table 11: 2006 DUI Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions. The specific court sanctions tallied include percentages of probation, jail, DUI programs (first-offender, 18-month, and 30-month DUI programs), and ignition interlock. Cross tabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 12: 2006 DUI Court Sanctions by County and Offender Status. This table displays the distribution of court sanctions by county for all DUI offenders.

From the data in these tables and those in Appendix B4, it is evident that the use of alternative sanctions continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status in 2006. For example:

#### Statewide Parameters:

- The court sanction most frequently applied to all convicted DUI offenders was probation (95.9%), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock (4.8%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 73.5% of the cases (in many jurisdictions, however, jail is often served as community service rather than actual jail time). This is shown in Table 11. Figure 6 (next page) graphically displays the statewide data from Table 11 showing the percentage representation of specific types of court-ordered sanctions among all convicted DUI offenders. Because virtually all offenders receive more than one type of sanction, the cumulative percentage adds to much more than 100%.



*Note:* License restriction and suspension sanctions will no longer be shown on this figure; they are completely imposed by DMV and not the courts (as of 9/20/2005).

Figure 6. Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2006).

#### County Variation:

- The use of DUI programs among first DUI offenders varies by county, from over 90% in 12 counties to 8.5% in Santa Barbara County (see Table 12).

#### Court Variation:

- Statewide, courts vary significantly in how they use available sanctions for DUI offenders. In Los Angeles County alone, one court (Lancaster) assigned jail to 96.1% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 1,257$ ), while another court (Malibu) in the same county assigned jail to only 19.3% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 300$ ). This is shown in Table B4 in the Appendix.
- In 2006, 0.2% of all DUI offenders were referred to 30-month DUI programs (see Table 11). Assignment of DUI offenders (mostly third-or-more) to 30-month programs was low, and varied significantly by court (see Table B4 in the Appendix).
- Statewide, courts required only 4.8% of all convicted DUI offenders to install an ignition interlock device in 2006. This is down from 6.3% in 1997 and 1998, primarily because legislation in 1999 shifted the mandatory interlock requirement from all repeat DUI offenders to all suspended or revoked DUI offenders caught driving while disqualified, and data on the new “mandatory” suspended or revoked interlock assignments are not captured by the DUI-MIS report.

### Variation by Offender Status:

- 66.1% of first DUI offenders arrested in 2006 were sentenced to jail, compared to 94% of all repeat offenders (see Table 11).
- 84.6% of first DUI offenders were assigned by courts to DUI intervention programs, along with 82.5% of second offenders, 67.4% of third offenders, and 34.5% of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. This is shown in Table 11. (By statute, however, all offenders must eventually complete specified DUI programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement).
- 15.2% of repeat DUI offenders were assigned ignition interlock in 2006, compared to 13.3% in 2005, 14.0% in 2004, 12.9% in 2003, 10.9% in 2002, 8.1% in 2001, 7.5% in 2000, 13.3% in 1999 and 22.3% in 1998. In spite of the old mandatory interlock law for all repeat offenders (AB 2851 - Freidman), which took effect on July 1, 1993, judges routinely did not assign interlock to these offenders (over 75% of “mandatory” assignments were not made). This law was repealed in 1998, and a new ignition interlock law (AB 762 - Torlakson) was enacted and implemented July 1, 1999, that established mandatory interlock for DUI suspension/revocation violators, while providing incentives for repeat offenders to reinstate early with interlock. Judicial assignments to the new mandatory provisions have steadily risen since the law was implemented, and proportionally more DUI suspension violators are now assigned to interlock than were repeat offenders under the old “mandatory” law.

TABLE 11: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS\*

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE	156595	95.9	73.5	63.4	18.9	0.2	4.8
1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	115138	96.9	66.1	82.4	2.2	0.0	1.0
REPEAT DUI	41457	93.3	94.0	10.5	65.5	0.6	15.2
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	30886	96.5	93.6	12.8	69.6	0.1	13.7
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7928	92.4	95.0	4.2	61.1	2.1	22.6
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2643	59.0	96.0	2.2	30.8	1.5	11.3

\*Entries represent percentages of 2006 DUI convictees receiving each sanction, by offender status. Sanctions within each offender status group (row) are not independent; therefore, row percentages always add to more than 100%. Percentages of sanctions by county and court appear in Appendix Table B4. The percentages of license restrictions and court suspensions were removed from this table and can be found in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5.

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE		156595	95.9	73.5	63.4	18.9	0.2	4.8
ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3876	98.4	97.2	81.4	2.3	0.0	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1104	99.5	97.2	16.2	53.8	0.0	24.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	280	98.9	91.1	4.3	60.0	0.7	33.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	73	89.0	95.9	5.5	24.7	0.0	9.6
	TOTAL	5333	98.6	96.9	62.8	16.3	0.1	7.8
ALPINE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	90.9	72.7	90.9	0.0	0.0	9.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	15	86.7	80.0	73.3	13.3	0.0	20.0
AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	202	95.5	98.0	90.6	3.0	0.0	13.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	62	98.4	98.4	8.1	83.9	0.0	69.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	95.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	85.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	TOTAL	290	95.2	98.3	64.8	27.2	0.0	31.4
BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	897	93.4	91.4	87.0	1.7	0.0	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	290	90.0	95.5	17.2	69.7	0.0	5.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	97	87.6	90.7	4.1	74.2	0.0	19.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	41	56.1	90.2	0.0	36.6	9.8	36.6
	TOTAL	1325	91.1	92.2	62.9	22.9	0.3	4.7
CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	150	95.3	95.3	86.7	2.7	0.0	15.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	53	100.0	100.0	15.1	83.0	0.0	41.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	17.6	76.5	0.0	64.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
	TOTAL	224	96.4	96.4	62.9	28.1	0.0	25.4
COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	128	88.3	92.2	78.1	2.3	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	90.9	93.2	31.8	50.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	84.2	100.0	0.0	26.3	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	60.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	201	87.1	92.5	56.7	14.9	0.0	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2311	95.8	92.8	87.8	2.6	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	732	98.6	97.3	13.4	76.4	0.0	0.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	218	94.5	97.7	0.5	72.0	0.0	1.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	59	74.6	98.3	0.0	45.8	0.0	3.4
	TOTAL	3320	96.0	94.2	64.1	24.2	0.0	0.3
DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	95	92.6	92.6	84.2	1.1	0.0	3.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	94.3	82.9	14.3	65.7	14.3	48.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	33.3	0.0	22.2	66.7	77.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0
	TOTAL	144	91.7	84.7	59.0	18.8	9.0	19.4
EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	740	96.4	95.8	87.2	2.6	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	233	96.6	98.3	19.3	68.2	0.0	5.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	72	94.4	95.8	5.6	66.7	0.0	11.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	44.4	100.0	0.0	25.9	0.0	3.7
	TOTAL	1072	95.0	96.5	64.7	21.7	0.0	2.1

\*Due to a law change, which shifted responsibility for license actions from courts to DMV as of September 20, 2005, SB 1697, the percentages of license restrictions and court suspensions by county and offender status are no longer presented in this Table. Statewide information on these sanctions is provided in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5.



TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3789	95.0	96.4	85.9	2.9	0.0	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1249	94.1	98.7	17.6	70.8	0.0	9.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	338	90.2	98.5	5.9	74.6	0.6	19.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	151	55.0	100.0	2.6	33.8	0.0	6.6
	TOTAL	5527	93.4	97.1	63.3	23.5	0.0	4.1
GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	203	95.6	67.5	70.0	8.9	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	84	92.9	96.4	20.2	48.8	0.0	4.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	25	100.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	41.7	100.0	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	324	93.2	78.7	50.9	23.8	0.0	1.2
HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	459	96.5	28.5	86.5	3.7	0.0	5.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	149	96.6	87.2	11.4	69.8	0.0	53.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	91.9	89.2	2.7	73.0	0.0	59.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	63.6	81.8	9.1	36.4	0.0	45.5
	TOTAL	656	95.7	46.2	63.4	23.2	0.0	19.8
IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	666	96.4	17.0	66.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	121	95.9	56.2	22.3	43.8	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	81.0	81.0	0.0	52.4	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	811	95.8	24.8	57.7	9.1	0.0	0.0
INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	167	93.4	30.5	83.8	3.6	0.0	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	50	86.0	86.0	12.0	60.0	0.0	6.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	92.9	7.1	78.6	0.0	50.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	237	89.9	47.7	62.0	19.8	0.0	4.6
KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3062	96.2	96.1	68.1	0.8	0.1	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	897	94.6	99.2	10.8	17.3	0.0	8.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	232	89.2	99.1	3.0	15.1	0.0	7.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	79	59.5	94.9	1.3	8.9	5.1	3.8
	TOTAL	4270	94.8	96.9	51.3	5.2	0.1	2.6
KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	700	90.6	96.0	74.9	1.1	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	201	86.1	95.5	24.9	46.8	0.0	3.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	49	63.3	95.9	8.2	28.6	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	9.5	90.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8
	TOTAL	971	86.5	95.8	59.5	11.9	0.0	1.0
LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	298	93.6	45.3	77.5	1.3	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	84	95.2	81.0	17.9	57.1	7.1	6.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	93.3	93.3	3.3	43.3	3.3	30.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
	TOTAL	417	93.8	56.6	59.2	15.8	1.7	3.8
LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	156	96.8	96.8	81.4	0.6	0.0	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	97.9	97.9	43.8	45.8	0.0	6.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	214	96.3	97.2	70.6	12.1	0.0	1.9

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22642	97.3	36.5	82.3	2.9	0.1	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5252	96.1	88.1	11.4	73.9	0.6	1.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1224	90.8	85.3	3.5	53.5	11.2	4.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	359	38.2	91.6	1.7	12.5	6.7	0.3
	TOTAL	29477	96.1	48.4	65.4	17.7	0.7	0.6
MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	491	94.5	95.3	85.7	2.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	173	92.5	97.1	19.7	62.4	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	38	81.6	89.5	7.9	55.3	7.9	2.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	77.3	95.5	0.0	54.5	4.5	0.0
	TOTAL	724	92.8	95.4	63.3	20.9	0.6	0.1
MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1050	97.4	10.9	90.3	2.6	0.0	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	241	99.2	87.1	5.0	81.3	0.0	9.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	64	100.0	93.8	3.1	29.7	0.0	40.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	95.2	100.0	0.0	52.4	0.0	57.1
	TOTAL	1376	97.8	29.4	69.9	18.4	0.0	4.9
MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	68	97.1	92.6	63.2	14.7	0.0	1.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	24	91.7	91.7	37.5	37.5	0.0	8.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	102	95.1	93.1	51.0	25.5	0.0	3.9
MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	664	92.6	94.4	83.4	2.6	0.0	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	221	95.5	99.1	15.8	72.9	0.0	44.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	96.9	96.9	3.1	78.5	0.0	67.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	71.4	95.2	4.8	33.3	0.0	19.0
	TOTAL	971	93.1	95.7	61.0	24.3	0.0	16.4
MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1064	97.0	95.4	87.7	3.7	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	307	98.0	97.4	26.1	66.8	0.3	0.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	78	94.9	97.4	14.1	65.4	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	24	70.8	95.8	4.2	37.5	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1473	96.7	95.9	69.6	20.6	0.1	0.1
MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	52	100.0	46.2	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	86.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	57.1	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	76	93.4	50.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	99	100.0	55.6	97.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	22	90.9	95.5	4.5	77.3	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	130	96.9	65.4	74.6	14.6	0.0	0.8
MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1812	98.4	97.2	63.8	2.0	0.0	10.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	498	98.0	99.4	9.8	61.6	0.0	68.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	117	99.1	99.1	3.4	41.0	0.0	85.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	37	75.7	97.3	0.0	16.2	0.0	43.2
	TOTAL	2464	98.0	97.7	49.1	16.1	0.0	26.1

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	675	96.1	90.8	88.7	2.8	0.0	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	194	97.9	99.0	19.6	76.8	0.0	27.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	46	93.5	97.8	6.5	78.3	0.0	56.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	61.5	92.3	0.0	46.2	0.0	7.7
	TOTAL	928	95.9	92.9	69.0	22.6	0.0	10.0
NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	399	98.2	95.7	94.0	1.5	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	155	99.4	99.4	16.8	79.4	0.0	6.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	39	100.0	97.4	7.7	71.8	0.0	25.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	100.0	85.7	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	600	98.7	96.7	67.3	26.5	0.0	3.5
ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10809	98.5	35.1	91.5	1.5	0.0	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2752	97.9	92.0	7.6	79.5	0.0	19.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	643	96.1	95.8	1.9	80.2	0.2	39.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	153	55.6	98.7	1.3	39.9	0.0	13.7
	TOTAL	14357	97.8	49.4	70.4	20.4	0.0	6.1
PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1738	98.6	97.5	25.5	2.1	0.0	2.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	442	98.0	99.1	10.0	76.0	0.0	50.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	115	85.2	97.4	10.4	65.2	0.0	55.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	38	39.5	100.0	2.6	31.6	0.0	31.6
	TOTAL	2333	96.8	97.8	21.5	19.7	0.0	14.7
PLUMAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	146	97.3	95.9	85.6	6.8	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	100.0	100.0	18.2	79.5	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	94.4	0.0	5.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	25.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	212	96.2	97.2	62.7	29.7	0.0	0.5
RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6078	96.6	93.6	91.1	1.5	0.0	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1440	95.3	97.4	15.1	76.1	0.0	7.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	345	91.0	98.8	8.4	76.2	0.0	13.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	145	64.1	99.3	3.4	53.8	0.0	7.6
	TOTAL	8008	95.5	94.6	72.3	19.1	0.0	2.4
SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4162	96.9	96.2	88.4	2.5	0.0	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1315	98.1	99.7	8.0	82.7	0.0	4.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	393	95.9	99.2	2.5	69.0	0.0	9.9
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	149	73.8	100.0	2.0	45.6	0.0	7.4
	TOTAL	6019	96.6	97.3	63.1	25.5	0.0	1.8
SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	239	95.8	90.0	53.6	0.4	0.0	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	85	98.8	98.8	5.9	42.4	0.0	25.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	87.5	100.0	6.3	18.8	0.0	68.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	349	95.4	92.8	38.4	11.5	0.0	10.3
SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6881	96.4	56.4	90.1	1.6	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1820	96.2	91.2	16.6	71.9	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	504	92.5	98.4	4.2	47.4	0.0	0.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	167	62.3	92.2	3.6	24.6	0.6	0.6
	TOTAL	9372	95.6	66.1	69.6	18.2	0.0	0.0

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11604	95.9	25.9	86.3	1.6	0.0	0.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2818	96.0	81.5	13.1	64.8	0.0	3.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	653	91.3	93.9	3.5	67.8	0.5	15.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	198	53.5	98.5	5.1	32.3	0.0	4.0
	TOTAL	15273	95.2	40.0	68.2	16.5	0.0	1.5
SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	735	98.5	98.2	94.1	2.6	0.0	3.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	160	98.8	98.8	20.6	74.4	1.2	41.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	96.4	96.4	10.7	78.6	3.6	71.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	77.8	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	66.7
	TOTAL	932	98.3	98.3	78.1	17.9	0.3	13.0
SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2332	98.7	97.1	90.2	2.5	0.0	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	739	97.6	99.1	12.0	81.2	0.0	18.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	225	93.3	96.4	3.1	72.0	2.2	29.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	121	78.5	90.1	2.5	56.2	0.8	24.0
	TOTAL	3417	97.4	97.2	64.5	26.0	0.2	7.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1479	97.7	95.4	90.3	1.8	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	432	98.1	99.3	12.0	81.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	131	94.7	99.2	9.9	74.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	40	72.5	100.0	10.0	27.5	0.0	2.5
	TOTAL	2082	97.1	96.5	67.5	23.2	0.0	0.0
SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2112	97.1	96.5	90.7	2.4	0.0	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	532	97.2	99.6	7.7	84.8	0.0	24.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	102	88.2	99.0	3.9	73.5	0.0	14.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	31	41.9	100.0	0.0	22.6	0.0	9.7
	TOTAL	2777	96.2	97.3	70.6	21.0	0.0	5.7
SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1783	95.8	65.0	8.5	1.5	0.0	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	475	96.6	94.1	0.6	74.1	0.0	5.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	165	92.7	95.8	0.0	78.2	0.0	14.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	28	53.6	96.4	0.0	35.7	0.0	3.6
	TOTAL	2451	95.3	73.1	6.3	21.1	0.0	2.1
SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4299	98.7	96.4	89.5	3.5	0.0	2.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1167	97.9	99.6	13.3	75.8	0.0	33.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	278	95.7	99.6	2.9	66.9	0.0	57.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	101	66.3	99.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	26.7
	TOTAL	5845	97.8	97.3	68.6	21.7	0.0	11.4
SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	974	98.4	95.7	73.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	324	98.5	97.8	9.3	50.6	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	94.5	98.9	2.2	13.2	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	40	80.0	100.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1429	97.6	96.5	52.4	13.2	0.0	0.0
SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	803	94.8	96.8	87.8	1.6	0.0	11.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	314	95.5	97.8	10.5	77.7	0.3	74.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	97	85.6	96.9	1.0	21.6	0.0	71.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	40.9	100.0	4.5	9.1	0.0	13.6
	TOTAL	1236	93.3	97.1	59.9	22.7	0.1	32.1

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	100.0	100.0	84.2	15.8	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	16.7	83.3	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	26	100.0	100.0	65.4	34.6	0.0	0.0
SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	243	92.6	90.1	79.0	2.1	0.0	1.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	79	97.5	97.5	25.3	67.1	0.0	24.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	26	88.5	96.2	11.5	69.2	3.8	50.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	11	45.5	63.6	0.0	18.2	0.0	9.1
	TOTAL	359	91.9	91.4	59.9	21.7	0.3	10.3
SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1142	96.2	94.9	88.8	2.7	0.0	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	369	94.6	98.9	14.9	77.0	0.0	5.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	130	86.2	96.9	3.8	75.4	0.0	6.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	33	48.5	97.0	3.0	30.3	0.0	6.1
	TOTAL	1674	94.1	96.0	64.2	25.3	0.0	2.3
SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1816	95.0	89.2	63.5	0.5	0.0	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	586	93.7	98.6	6.7	44.0	0.0	9.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	154	87.0	100.0	1.3	16.9	0.0	27.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	66	57.6	100.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	12.1
	TOTAL	2622	93.3	92.2	45.5	11.4	0.0	4.5
STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1543	97.1	94.4	82.1	5.3	0.1	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	446	98.7	98.9	19.5	68.8	0.0	5.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	104	98.1	100.0	7.7	74.0	0.0	10.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	39	79.5	97.4	5.1	56.4	2.6	17.9
	TOTAL	2132	97.2	95.6	64.0	22.9	0.1	2.3
SUTTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	316	92.4	96.8	88.9	0.6	0.3	2.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	90	90.0	98.9	17.8	70.0	0.0	44.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	31	100.0	100.0	9.7	80.6	0.0	77.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	9	44.4	100.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	446	91.5	97.5	67.3	21.1	0.2	16.1
TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	277	91.7	98.9	82.3	3.6	0.0	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	84	88.1	98.8	11.9	69.0	0.0	6.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	63.0	100.0	0.0	59.3	0.0	22.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	10	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
	TOTAL	398	86.9	99.0	59.8	21.1	0.0	4.8
TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	48	64.6	95.8	58.3	2.1	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	70.4	96.3	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	87.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	86	68.6	94.2	36.0	18.6	1.2	0.0
TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1877	94.8	86.4	79.5	2.7	0.0	2.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	578	93.9	96.5	11.2	69.4	0.0	15.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	167	89.2	96.4	5.4	66.5	0.0	31.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	82	58.5	97.6	2.4	19.5	0.0	20.7
	TOTAL	2704	93.2	89.5	58.0	21.4	0.0	7.2

TABLE 12: 2006 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	265	92.5	96.2	85.7	2.6	0.0	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	105	97.1	100.0	7.6	81.0	0.0	5.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	95.5	100.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	45.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	10	20.0	100.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	402	92.0	97.5	58.5	23.9	0.0	4.5
VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3400	97.9	88.0	71.8	0.9	0.0	7.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	817	98.8	96.8	10.8	60.3	0.0	68.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	207	98.6	96.6	4.8	61.8	0.0	82.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	65	61.5	100.0	0.0	47.7	0.0	61.5
	TOTAL	4489	97.5	90.2	56.6	15.2	0.0	22.5
YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	774	95.3	94.4	75.1	2.3	0.0	1.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	193	97.9	97.9	41.5	33.7	0.0	42.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	50	90.0	96.0	16.0	30.0	0.0	64.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	21	52.4	90.5	0.0	9.5	0.0	9.5
	TOTAL	1038	94.7	95.1	64.5	9.6	0.0	12.0
YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	318	97.5	91.8	84.6	3.1	0.0	2.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	106	96.2	99.1	15.1	73.6	0.0	13.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	11.1	55.6	0.0	44.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	13	76.9	84.6	0.0	23.1	15.4	7.7
	TOTAL	455	96.5	93.6	63.1	22.2	0.4	6.6

## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

This section presents reoffense and crash rates of DUI offenders over various time periods, as well as the methodology and results of evaluations assessing the effectiveness of DUI intervention programs referred to drivers convicted for the first time of an alcohol-related offense.

The first part of the section examines descriptive indicators, such as DUI recidivism and crash rates, for different groups of DUI offenders within different periods of time: 1) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders from 1990-2006, 2) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for 2006 first and second DUI offenders, 3) proportions of DUI program referrals for 2006 first and second DUI offenders, and 4) long term recidivism rates of the 1994 DUI offenders.

The second part of the section contains the results of several analyses evaluating the effectiveness of DUI intervention programs for two groups of DUI offenders: 1) drivers convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving, and 2) first DUI offenders who attended 3-month or 9-month DUI programs.

Also, in the second part of the section, and like last year, are two additional subanalyses: 1) an evaluation of 9-month DUI programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels below 0.20% versus first DUI offenders with BAC levels of 0.20% or above, and 2) an evaluation of the relative effectiveness of 3-month versus 9-month DUI programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels of 0.20% and above.

The following are highlights of the findings:

- The 1-year recidivism rates for all first offenders in 2006 continued to remain at the lower level of the past eight years. The DUI reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 2006 was 40.8% lower than the reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 1990 (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).
- The 1-year reoffense rate for second offenders continues the decline that started three years ago, and is substantially lower than the rates during the early 1990s; recidivism decreased from 9.7% in 1990 to 5.5% in 2006, a 43.3% relative decrease for all second offenders (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).

- Overall, subsequent 1-year crash rates among second offenders have declined from 4.0% in 1990 to 2.7% in 2006, a 32.5% relative decrease. The crash rate for first offenders has also declined, although not as much as second offenders; their 2006 rate is 13.2% lower than their 1990 crash rate (see Figure 8 and Table 13a).
- Of the 2006 DUI arrestees who enrolled in a DUI intervention program, 86.5% of first offenders and 44.7% of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 14).
- At the end of 13 years, 29% of DUI offenders originally convicted in 1994 had at least one subsequent DUI conviction, and 32% incurred at least one DUI incident (see Figure 9a).
- Over 13 years, recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third offenders reoffending was 40%, while 32% of second offenders and 26% of first offenders reoffended (see Figure 9b).
- Males showed a much higher cumulative proportion (30%) of reoffenses than did females (21%) over the 13-year time period (see Figure 9c).
- Long-term recidivism rates are inversely related to age, with higher reoffense rates associated with the youngest age group, and the lowest rates with the oldest group (see Figure 9d).
- After 5 years, the proportion of DUI offenders reoffending in the 1994 group was much lower (18%) compared to the proportion reoffending in the 1984 group (27%) and in the 1980 group (35%). The 2000 group of DUI offenders had the lowest proportion of reoffenses (17%). This is shown in Figure 9e.
- Similar to the last four years' evaluations, this year's results continue to show that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders assigned to a DUI intervention program did not vary significantly from those of the nonparticipants. Also, the subsequent DUI incident rates of the program participants were not significantly lower than those of the nonparticipants (see Table 16a).
- Similar to the past years' evaluations, the 1-year crash rates of first offenders attending the 3-month program were not significantly higher than those attending 9-month programs. However, as consistently evident in previous evaluations, the



subsequent DUI incident rate of the short-term program participants was again significantly ( $p < .0001$ ) lower than that of the long-term participants (see Table 16b).

- Among first DUI offenders assigned to 9-month DUI programs, crash rates of the offenders with BAC levels 0.20% and above were higher than the crash rates of those with BAC levels below 0.20%, but this result did not reach statistical significance ( $p = .095$ ). Previous analyses also did not show significant crash differences between the two groups. However, DUI offenders with BAC levels 0.20% and above had significantly ( $p = .04$ ) more DUI incidents (23.3%) than those with BAC levels below 0.20% (see Table 16c). This finding was also evident in the past three year's evaluations.
- Consistent with the past three years' results, the length of time of DUI program (3-month vs. 9-month) had no effect on crash rates and DUI incidents for first DUI offenders with BAC levels 0.20% and above (see Table 16d).

Subject Selection and Data Collection: Convicted DUI and alcohol-related reckless offenders were identified from monthly abstract update tapes which contain all DUI conviction data reported to DMV by the courts. Except for the 1994 cases, subjects were selected based on the number of prior DUI and alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within ten years (instead of seven years due to a law change effective January 1, 2005) prior to their entry DUI arrest in 2006. For this year's report, subjects selected were: 1) first DUI offenders—drivers who had no DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within the previous ten years, 2) second DUI offenders—drivers who had one DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction within the previous ten years, 3) alcohol-related reckless offenders with no previous DUI offenses in the past ten years, and 4) first DUI offenders referred to 3-month and 9-month DUI programs. In addition, all DUI offenders arrested in 1994 were selected for the 13-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders over time, and the effectiveness of DUI programs for persons convicted of an alcohol-reckless or first DUI offense, are evaluated in terms of postconviction driving record, as measured by: 1) total crashes and 2) DUI incidents, which include alcohol-involved crashes, DUI convictions, Administrative Per Se suspensions (APS for 0.08% BAC or chemical test refusal), and DUI failure-to-appear notices (FTA). For the 1994 DUI offenders, recidivism is measured by subsequent DUI convictions, along with one comparison of DUI incidents.

Although the sanction analyses are not conducted for first and second DUI offenders, the 1-year unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all of the previous and current evaluations were included. In order to maintain comparability to the previous subject selection criteria, certain types of offenders had to be excluded. These previous and current analyses excluded offenders with felony convictions and chemical test refusal suspensions because their license control penalties were different from the misdemeanor offender groups. Drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent time period (because of late conviction dates) were also excluded, as were drivers with “X” license numbers (meaning that no California license number could be found) and drivers with out-of-state ZIP Codes. Altogether, the excluded cases represented about 31% of the original convicted offender file. The only exclusions made for the 1994 offenders were the out-of-state cases and drivers with “X” license numbers.

### DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES

#### One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders from 1990-2006

The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident reoffense rates for both first and second DUI offenders were compiled from the 17 previous and current annual DUI-MIS evaluations and configured onto two separate graphs to display these rates over time.

Figure 7 shows the proportions of first and second offenders, arrested between 1990 and 2006, who reoffended within one year after conviction.




Figure 7. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2006).

This figure and Table 13a show an ongoing gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first offenders overall from 1990 to 2006. The overall decline translates into a 40.8% reduction in recidivism for all first offenders compared to the rates of 1990. The decline in DUI reoffenses is steeper in the early years (1990-1994), following the enactment of APS suspensions for all DUI arrestees. As is evident in Figure 7, the reoffense rates of first offenders continue to be lower than those of the second offenders; this has been consistently evident throughout all previous analyses conducted on first and second offenders.

TABLE 13a: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT  
DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND  
SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2006

YEAR	DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED		CRASH-INVOLVED	
	FIRST DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND DUI OFFENDERS	FIRST DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND DUI OFFENDERS
1990	7.6	9.7	5.3	4.0
1991	7.1	9.5	4.7	3.6
1992	6.2	9.1	4.1	3.5
1993	5.8	8.8	4.1	3.5
1994	5.4	7.0	4.5	3.1
1995	5.8	7.0	4.6	3.0
1996	5.1	6.1	4.5	2.4
1997	5.2	6.0	4.7	2.7
1998	5.3	6.0	4.8	2.6
1999	5.0	6.1	5.0	2.8
2000	4.9	6.1	5.1	3.1
2001	4.9	5.9	5.2	3.0
2002	4.8	6.1	5.1	3.3
2003	4.7	6.5	4.8	3.2
2004	4.5	5.9	4.8	3.1
2005	4.7	5.6	4.8	3.0
2006	4.5	5.5	4.6	2.7
% DIFFERENCE 1990-2006	-40.8%	-43.3%	-13.2%	-32.5%

As noted in the past three years, a similar overall decline is evident in the 1-year reoffense rates for the second offender group as displayed in Figure 7 and Table 13a, with the greatest rate of decline occurring during the years from 1993 to 1996. Table 13a shows that, from 1990 to 2006, the reoffense rates decreased 43.3% among second

offenders. The overall reoffense rates of second offenders remain higher than those of first offenders. Previous DUI-MIS reports suggested that, while many factors may be associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents for both first and second offenders, the reduction may largely be attributed to the implementation of APS suspensions in 1990. An evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS Law documents recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders, and 19.5% for repeat offenders, attributable to the law.

The 1-year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders were also compiled from previous and current DUI-MIS evaluations and graphically displayed over time. Figure 8 shows the proportions of 1990-2006 first and second offenders who had crashes within one year after their conviction.




Figure 8. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2006).

Among first offenders from 1990 through 2006, Figure 8 and Table 13a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by an ongoing increase after 1993, and then leveling off. The relative difference between first offender crash rates in 1990 and 2006 is -13.2%, whereas the relative difference for second offenders for those same years shows a much greater decline in crash involvement of -32.5%.

Overall, second offenders have lower crash rates than do first offenders (Table 13a), and this fact has been well documented in past evaluations; it has been speculated that the lower crash rate of second offenders may be related to the longer-term (one to two years) license (restriction/suspension) actions imposed on second offenders.

#### One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2006

For the fourth year, the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism and crash rates, by county, are reported for both first and second DUI offenders.

Table 13b displays the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism rates of offenders arrested in 2006. As shown in this table, among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent DUI incident within one year varied from 6.5% in San Bernardino County to 2.6% in San Joaquin County. Among the smaller counties, Mariposa, Modoc, Plumas and Trinity had DUI recidivism rates above 8.0%, while Alpine and Sierra had zero DUI recidivism rates. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, Fresno County had the highest rate, with 7.9% of second offenders having a subsequent DUI incident within one year whereas San Joaquin County's second offenders had the lowest rate at 2.0%. Among the smaller counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from 15.0% (Trinity) to 0.0% (Alpine, Amador, and Sierra).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2006 are displayed in Table 13c. Among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent crash within one year varied from 5.6% in Riverside County to 2.8% in Fresno County. Among the smaller counties, Trinity had a crash rate of 10.8%, while Alpine and Modoc had a 0.0% crash rate. In contrast to DUI recidivism rates, second offenders have generally lower crash rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, the rate at which second offenders have a subsequent crash within one year varied from 3.7% (San Diego) to 0.0% (San Joaquin). Among the smaller counties, one county had a crash rate of 15.0% (Trinity), and eight counties had 0.0% crash rates (Alpine, Colusa, Lake, Lassen, Mono, Nevada, Sierra, and Sutter).

TABLE 13b. 2006 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

COUNTY	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER		2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDER	
	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	3514	4.5	1187	5.5
ALAMEDA	126	4.7	47	6.4
ALPINE	0	0.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	4	2.4	0	0.0
BUTTE	42	5.8	21	8.9
CALAVERAS	3	2.4	1	2.2
COLUSA	5	5.7	1	3.2
CONTRA COSTA	74	4.4	28	5.6
DEL NORTE	4	5.6	3	10.7
EL DORADO	28	5.3	5	2.9
FRESNO	131	5.0	66	7.9
GLENN	9	6.9	4	6.3
HUMBOLDT	19	5.3	6	5.5
IMPERIAL	19	5.1	4	5.6
INYO	5	4.0	2	5.0
KERN	90	4.7	36	6.0
KINGS	28	6.0	12	8.4
LAKE	11	5.0	2	3.1
LASSEN	1	1.0	2	5.4
LOS ANGELES	600	3.9	193	5.1
MADERA	13	5.7	3	4.2
MARIN	31	4.5	8	5.0
MARIPOSA	6	10.5	2	8.7
MENDOCINO	26	5.0	19	9.9
MERCED	37	6.1	15	8.2
MODOC	3	8.8	1	7.1
MONO	1	1.6	1	5.9
MONTEREY	44	4.8	16	5.8
NAPA	22	5.4	6	4.7
NEVADA	17	5.4	4	3.2
ORANGE	277	3.7	51	2.9
PLACER	55	4.1	8	2.2
PLUMAS	10	8.3	2	5.0
RIVERSIDE	216	5.0	60	5.6
SACRAMENTO	59	5.3	17	5.0
SAN BENITO	179	5.8	74	7.5
SAN BERNARDINO	10	6.5	2	4.5
SAN DIEGO	230	4.7	79	6.3
SAN FRANCISCO	296	3.9	84	4.4
SAN JOAQUIN	14	2.6	2	2.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	103	6.5	42	7.9
SAN MATEO	53	3.5	20	5.2
SANTA BARBARA	38	3.3	13	4.0
SANTA CLARA	104	3.7	37	4.9
SANTA CRUZ	28	3.8	17	7.2
SHASTA	38	5.9	18	7.1
SIERRA	0	0.0	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	10	6.0	4	7.8
SOLANO	52	6.4	24	8.7
SONOMA	53	4.5	15	4.0
STANISLAUS	64	5.8	20	6.1
SUTTER	13	5.8	3	4.9
TEHAMA	9	4.2	5	7.2
TRINITY	4	10.8	3	15.0
TULARE	60	5.0	33	8.5
TUOLUMNE	17	7.4	5	5.5
VENTURA	94	4.4	29	5.8
YOLO	15	2.8	9	6.2
YUBA	14	6.2	3	3.6

TABLE 13c. 2006 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY  
COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

COUNTY	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER		2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDER	
	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	3592	4.6	588	2.7
ALAMEDA	134	5.0	19	2.6
ALPINE	0	0.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	6	3.7	1	1.9
BUTTE	25	3.5	2	0.8
CALAVERAS	6	4.8	1	2.2
COLUSA	2	2.3	0	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	75	4.5	11	2.2
DEL NORTE	6	8.5	1	3.6
EL DORADO	18	3.4	4	2.4
FRESNO	73	2.8	23	2.7
GLENN	4	3.1	1	1.6
HUMBOLDT	15	4.2	1	0.9
IMPERIAL	12	3.3	4	5.6
INYO	3	2.4	1	2.5
KERN	68	3.5	15	2.5
KINGS	29	6.2	5	3.5
LAKE	9	4.1	0	0.0
LASSEN	1	1.0	0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	812	5.3	128	3.4
MADERA	8	3.5	4	5.6
MARIN	31	4.5	4	2.5
MARIPOSA	2	3.5	3	13.0
MENDOCINO	15	2.9	7	3.7
MERCED	30	5.0	5	2.7
MODOC	0	0.0	1	7.1
MONO	1	1.6	0	0.0
MONTEREY	38	4.2	9	3.2
NAPA	25	6.1	2	1.6
NEVADA	14	4.4	0	0.0
ORANGE	354	4.8	43	2.4
PLACER	49	3.6	11	3.1
PLUMAS	2	1.7	1	2.5
RIVERSIDE	244	5.6	37	3.4
SACRAMENTO	59	5.3	9	2.7
SAN BENITO	164	5.3	34	3.4
SAN BERNARDINO	5	3.2	1	2.3
SAN DIEGO	236	4.8	46	3.7
SAN FRANCISCO	289	3.8	36	1.9
SAN JOAQUIN	20	3.7	0	0.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	88	5.6	14	2.6
SAN MATEO	47	3.1	8	2.1
SANTA BARBARA	40	3.4	8	2.5
SANTA CLARA	131	4.7	14	1.9
SANTA CRUZ	29	3.9	4	1.7
SHASTA	25	3.9	5	2.0
SIERRA	1	6.3	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	5	3.0	1	2.0
SOLANO	34	4.2	9	3.2
SONOMA	60	5.1	9	2.4
STANISLAUS	56	5.1	6	1.8
SUTTER	7	3.1	0	0.0
TEHAMA	9	4.2	2	2.9
TRINITY	4	10.8	3	15.0
TULARE	39	3.2	12	3.1
TUOLUMNE	12	5.2	2	2.2
VENTURA	95	4.4	14	2.8
YOLO	19	3.6	4	2.8
YUBA	7	3.1	3	3.6

### The Proportions of DUI Program Referrals, Enrollments, and Completions for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2006

For the first time, this current report captures the number and proportions of convicted first and second offenders whose records indicated that they had enrolled and completed a DUI intervention program, upon referral received from the court (in previous years Table 14 showed only the proportions of program referrals and completions for these offenders). Inclusion of the information on enrollments was possible due to a recent addition of a new subrecord to each person's driving record that contains data on DUI program enrollment and completion dates, court information relevant to the DUI conviction, and program length of time. Previous efforts were limited by the lack of organized fields of data even though part of this information was available.

Table 14 shows the proportions of referrals to the various DUI programs for first and second offenders. It can be seen from this table that 83.6% of first offenders and 71.7% of second offenders were referred to a DUI program. Table 14 also shows that 66.7% of first offenders have enrolled in DUI programs that range from 3 to 9 months, depending upon their BAC levels at the time of their arrest. Furthermore, 46.2% of second offenders enrolled in the 18-month DUI program. Of those enrolled in DUI intervention programs, 86.5% of first offenders and 44.7% of second offenders completed their program assignment (some second offenders may still be enrolled in the program at the time of data collection).

TABLE 14: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM  
REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED  
FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2006

DUI OFFENDERS	TOTAL	PROGRAM REFERRALS		PROGRAM ENROLLMENT		PROGRAM COMPLETION		
	N	N	%	N	%	N	% <sup>1</sup>	% <sup>2</sup>
1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDERS (3 MOS. TO 9 MOS.)	113,688	95,039	83.6%	75,882	66.7%	65,600	57.7%	86.5%
2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDERS (18 MOS.)	30,886	22,130	71.7%	14,268	46.2%	6,379	20.7%	44.7%

<sup>1</sup> % of total number of DUI offenders.

<sup>2</sup> % of program enrollees.



### Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders


Since all DUI offenders were included in the 1994 group, it was possible to observe and compare the long-term recidivism rates for subdivided groups within the 1994 cohort, and to see how these groups differ in their long-term recidivism rates. This approach was also taken in a previous study conducted by Peck (1991), in which the reoffense failure curves of various groups among 1980 and 1984 DUI offenders were evaluated. Failure curves are cumulative percentages over time that display the first reoffense that occurs after the initial DUI conviction. Both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 13-year follow-up period for the 1994 group were included as outcome data in order to maintain comparability with the 1984 and 1980 cohorts from a previous evaluation (Peck, 1991).

Table 15 shows cumulative percentages of the first DUI reoffenses for the 1994 offenders, as well as 9- and 13-year cumulative percentages for the 1980 and 1994 groups and 5-year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group (data were not available beyond 5 years).

TABLE 15: CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT  
DUI REOFFENSES FOR 1994 DUI OFFENDERS

YEAR	PERCENTAGE											
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	MALES	FEMALES	16-25	26-45	46-65	65+	1980	1984	1994
1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	6	6	5	3	5	5	4	3	11	7	5
2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	10	12	10	6	10	9	8	6	19	15	9
3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	14	17	13	9	14	13	11	8	25	20	13
4 <sup>TH</sup>	14	18	21	16	11	18	16	13	9	30	24	16
5 <sup>TH</sup>	17	21	25	19	13	20	18	15	10	35	27	18
6 <sup>TH</sup>	19	23	28	22	14	23	21	17	10	38	NA	21
7 <sup>TH</sup>	20	25	31	23	16	25	23	18	11	40	NA	22
8 <sup>TH</sup>	22	27	33	25	17	26	24	19	11	42	NA	24
9 <sup>TH</sup>	23	28	35	26	18	28	25	20	12	44	NA	25
10 <sup>TH</sup>	24	30	36	27	19	29	27	21	12	NA	NA	26
11 <sup>TH</sup>	25	31	38	28	20	30	28	22	12	NA	NA	27
12 <sup>TH</sup>	25	32	39	29	21	31	28	22	12	NA	NA	28
13 <sup>th</sup>	26	32	40	30	21	32	29	22	12	NA	NA	29


In addition to Table 15, Figures 9a through 9e display recidivism rates for 1994 offenders over 13 years.



*Figure 9a.* Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction, and first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incidents (alcohol crashes, major convictions, APS suspensions and DUI FTAs).

Figure 9a shows that, for 1994 offenders as a whole, at the end of 13 years 29% accumulated at least one DUI reoffense. When considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses including all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increased to 32%. These failure curves are steepest in the earliest years following the initial conviction, after which they start to flatten out, but are still rising slightly in the 7th through 13th years. For both measures, the steepest climb occurs in the first year following conviction.

One way to explore the extent of drinking severity is to examine the recidivism rates by the number of prior DUIs within ten years (time frame for counting priors) of the entry DUI violation. Figure 9b displays the cumulative proportions of reoffenses by first, second, and third-or-more DUI offenders.



*Figure 9b.* Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions.

It is evident from this graph and from Table 15 that the recidivism failure curves increase as the number of prior offenses becomes greater. Third-or-more offenders have the highest overall failure curve, and continue to maintain the higher proportions over the 13-year time period. At the end of 13 years, 40% of third-or-more offenders have reoffended compared to 32% of second offenders and 26% of first offenders.

Since the majority of DUI offenders has always been male (87% in 1994), it is relevant to inspect the recidivism rates of the 1994 offenders by gender. As evident in Figure 9c and Table 15, males show much higher cumulative proportions reoffending than females. At the end of 13 years, 30% of males have reoffended as compared to 21% of females. The failure curve of females is noticeably lower and increases at a slower pace throughout the 13 years as compared to the curve of males. In the final five years, the proportion of males recidivating is only one percent per year.




Figure 9c. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed by age as well. Figure 9d displays the failure curves of four age groups. It is evident that reoffense rates are inversely related to age; the failure rates are highest for the youngest group and lowest for the oldest group. Over 13 years, the failure curves of the two youngest groups are quite close to each other and are much steeper than the curve of the oldest group; the failure curves of the youngest groups are steepest during the first two years following the entry conviction. The failure curve of the 65+ group flattens out at the 5<sup>th</sup> year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality factor of the oldest group could influence the lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be restricting their driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 13 years, the youngest two groups reoffended by 32% and 29%, respectively, while 22% of the middle age group, for which mortality may also be a factor, and 12% of the oldest group recidivated.




Figure 9d. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date).

The final figure, Figure 9e, compares the 1994 recidivism curves with those of the 1980, 1984, and 2000 cohorts over a 5-year time period.




Figure 9e. Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2000 DUI drivers.

Two years ago, the reoffense rates of the 2000 cohort over the 5-year time period were added along with the cumulative percentages of the 1980, 1984 and 1994 groups (Figure 9e and Table 15). It is possible to view this long-term historical comparison with consideration of the probable influence of major DUI laws in California over a 20-year time period.

Figure 9e reveals that at the end of five years, 35% of the 1980 offenders reoffended compared to 27% of the 1984 group, 18% of the 1994 offenders and 17% of the 2000 group. Quite dramatically, the proportion recidivating in the 1994 and 2000 groups (18%, 17%) dropped by half compared to those in the 1980 group (35%). Major pieces of DUI legislation were enacted in California over this time span of 20 years. The noticeably lower reoffense proportions of the 1984 group (27%) compared to the 1980 group (35%) can likely be attributed to the 1982 laws, AB 541 (Moorhead), which applied tougher sanctions on DUI offenders, and AB 7 (Hart) which established the 0.10% per se BAC illegal limit. The effectiveness of these laws was confirmed by a previous California study by Tashima and Peck (1986). Table 15, which compares the 1980 cohort with the 1994 group over nine years, shows that 44% of the 1980 group recidivated while 25% of the 1994 group reoffended. The difference between the recidivism rates of these two groups remains quite dramatic at the end of nine years. There was only a one percent increase in recidivism each year for the 1994 group in years 8 through 13.

Continuing with Figure 9e, it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions between the 1984 group (27%) and the 1994 group (18%) is substantial; this reduction in reoffenses is possibly attributable to the enactment of the 1990 laws, SB 1623 (Lockyer), which established APS suspensions for all offenders at the time of arrest, and SB 1150 (Lockyer), which set the illegal BAC limit to 0.08% and imposed other stringent sanctions on DUI offenders. As noted earlier, an evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS law documented recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders, both attributable to the APS law. Figure 9e also shows that the level of reoffenses is very similar for both the 1994 and 2000 cohorts. At each of the five years, the reoffenses of the 2000 offenders were only 1% lower than that of the 1994 group.

In summary, the 1994 offenders have long-term reoffense rates that are higher among those with more DUI priors (within seven years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers. These findings are not surprising and are consistent and supported by previous studies. In comparing the reoffense rates between the 1994 and 2000 groups with the 1980 and 1984 offenders, it was found that the cumulative proportions of

reoffenses was much lower among the 1994 and 2000 offenders. The dramatically lower reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2000 groups could be attributed to the enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders in the past two decades, including the APS suspension law of 1990.

## DUI PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS

*Subject Selection and Follow-up Data:* The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of DUI programs for offenders convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving, or for a first DUI offenders, was established by legislation. The evaluation for the offenders with alcohol-related reckless convictions was mandated by SB 1176 (Johnson); for these offenders, this legislation requires the courts to order enrollment in a DUI intervention program as a condition of probation. An evaluation of the efficacy of the 3-month versus 6-month DUI intervention program for first offenders was mandated by AB 1916 (Torlakson). In 2004, the courts were required to refer first offenders whose BAC level is less than 0.20% to a 3-month program, and those with a BAC level of 0.20% or above, or who refuse to take a chemical test, to a 6-month program. Effective 2005, AB 1353 (Liu) increased the duration of DUI intervention programs from 6 to 9 months for first DUI offenders on probation whose BAC level is 0.20% or greater or who refuse to take a chemical test.

Two groups of alcohol-related reckless convictees were identified, including: 1) those who were assigned to a DUI intervention program and 2) those who were not assigned to a program. These sanctions are reported by the courts to DMV via disposition codes on the conviction abstracts. Although courts are mandated to require all alcohol-related reckless drivers to attend a DUI intervention program as a condition of probation, it was found that 39% of such offenders were not assigned. This discrepancy allowed a comparison of subsequent crashes and DUI incidents between the two groups.

In evaluating the traffic safety impact of length of time of DUI intervention programs, first offenders that showed the 3-month and 9-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for the analysis. Since, as of 2005, the courts were to prescribe 9-month DUI program for first offenders whose BAC level is 0.20% or above, it was decided to investigate the impact of the 9-month instead of 6-month DUI program for this year's analysis.

The records of 52% of first offenders who were referred to DUI intervention program either did not indicate the specific length of time of the program or indicated other lengths of time that were not three or nine months. These individuals were not included in this evaluation, and the analysis is limited to first offenders that were adjudicated by the courts that were in compliance with the law. Of the total sample selected, 75% were referred to 3-month programs, while 25% were assigned to 9-month programs. To further explore the possible effects of BAC levels, two additional subanalyses included 1) first offenders assigned to a 9-month DUI program with BAC levels below 0.20% versus those with BAC levels of 0.20% and above, and 2) first offenders with BAC levels 0.20% and above assigned to a 3-month DUI program versus first offenders with BAC levels 0.20% and above assigned to a 9-month DUI program.

The conviction date was considered to be the "treatment date" for defining prior and subsequent driving record data, because the penalties and sanctions for the offense are typically effective as of that date. The evaluation periods for the postconviction driving measures start from the conviction date, and were: 1) 1-year following conviction for alcohol-related reckless offenders who were arrested from July, 2006 through June, 2007, and 2) 1-year following conviction for first DUI convictees who were arrested in 2006, and who were referred to 3-month and 9-month DUI programs.

A buffer period of four months was allowed between the end of the evaluation period and the extraction date to allow for processing and reporting of the most recent data to DMV. DUI offenders who had less than the full one-year follow-up time period (from conviction date to the buffer period) were excluded. For all of these groups, the outcome driver record measures consisted of the proportion of offenders who were involved in: 1) any crash and 2) DUI incidents (alcohol-involved crashes, major convictions, APS/refusal suspensions, or DUI failures-to-appear). Only the first crash or DUI incident or "failure" was evaluated. This is not an important limitation with the data because the incidence of repeat failures (two or more crashes or DUI incidents) was very low over the study time window. More importantly, analysis of repeat failures would be subject to confounding by court sanctions received in connection with the first failure incident. Therefore, this type of confounding is avoided because multiple incidents were not included in this analysis.



*Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures:* Since it was not possible to randomly assign drivers to the various sanction groups, potential biases due to preexisting group differences were statistically controlled to the extent possible by using biographical data, prior driving record data, and ZIP Code indices, such as crash and traffic conviction averages for each driver's ZIP Code area (Appendix Table B5). While this "quasi-experimental" design is subject to a number of limitations in assessing cause-effect relationships, the attempt to statistically control for group differences removes at least part of the bias in group assignment and provides a more precise estimate of the relationship between type of sanction and subsequent record. It is possible, of course, that the groups also differ on characteristics not measured or reflected in covariates. The possibility of uncontrolled biases becomes particularly problematic if sanctions are commonly received by offenders through self- or judicial-selectivity (e.g., drivers of higher socio-economic status may be more likely to receive program with restriction and less likely to receive jail than those of lower status).


For the alcohol-related reckless drivers and first offenders attending 3-month and 9-month programs, prior driver record data were extracted for the two years preceding their DUI or alcohol-reckless conviction date. The prior driver record variables for these offenders are shown in Appendix Table B5, and since some of these driver record variables were significantly different between the two groups, they were used as covariates in the analyses to remove these differences.

Following the extraction of covariates, simple correlations were computed between demographic, prior driving variables, and the outcome measures (number of days to first subsequent crash and number of days to first subsequent DUI incident). The demographic and 2-year prior driving variables that had statistically significant correlations with the outcome measures were identified and selected as potential covariates. For each logistic regression analysis, potential interactions between the covariates and treatment/comparison groups were tested. In analyses where there are significant interactions, the levels of the covariate and treatment groups were plotted on a graph to determine if there are differential effects of DUI programs on the covariate levels. The interaction term is then typically included in the final logistic regression analyses.

For the alcohol-reckless drivers, there were not significant interactions between the covariates and the DUI program sanction on either crashes or DUI reoffenses.

### DUI Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol-Reckless Driving

Figure 10a and Table 16a display the results of the eighth evaluation of the effectiveness of the DUI program on drivers convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving violations.



*Figure 10a.* Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2006-2007 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.

Total Crashes: Like the past three years' findings, the results show that assignment to the DUI intervention program does not have a significant effect on 1-year subsequent crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders; the slight differences between the two groups may be due to chance alone. Comparing these rates to the rates of the 2006 first DUI offenders, it is evident that alcohol-related reckless drivers who are assigned and those not assigned to a DUI program are slightly more involved in crashes (6.14 and 5.26 per 100 drivers, respectively, see Table 16a) than are first DUI offenders (4.6 per 100 drivers; see Table 13a). The crash rates of the 2006 alcohol-reckless drivers with no program are slightly higher than in the previous evaluations of alcohol-reckless drivers. For example, in the previous three years' evaluations, 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless drivers with no program were 4.95, 5.13 and 5.44, respectively. At the same time, the crash rates for those involved in the DUI intervention program were 5.07, 5.24, and 5.82, relatively unchanged from 5.26 found this year. These drivers who were arrested with a BAC level of 0.08% and above would have incurred an APS license suspension/restriction prior to their conviction. Table 9a shows that about 88% of the alcohol-reckless drivers had BAC levels of 0.08% and above.

TABLE 16a: THE EFFECT OF DUI PROGRAM ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
7/2006 - 6/2007 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)	1) No program	(2,724)	6.14	16.7%	3.37	11.6%
	2) DUI program	(4,534)	5.26		3.02	

DUI Incidents: Figure 10a and Table 16a indicate that program participants do not show significantly fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the DUI programs relative to the nonparticipants. The reoffense rate of the alcohol-reckless offenders not assigned to the programs is 11.6% higher than the reoffense rate of the program participants, but this difference is not large enough to be significant. These results have to be viewed with some caution because random assignment to program attendance was not possible; there still remains the possibility of uncontrolled biases through self- or judicial-selectivity, even though statistical control of group differences removed part of the biases based on available covariates.

#### Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders

Total Crashes: Figure 10b and Table 16b display the results of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the DUI intervention program on first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month versus 9-month programs. Similar to last year's findings, the results show that the length of time of the DUI program does not have an effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders. The 3-month program participants have a 5.4% higher crash rate than that of the 9-month participants, but this difference is not significantly large enough to conclude that the 9-month program was more effective in reducing crashes than 3-month program.




Figure 10b. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2006) by length of DUI program.

TABLE 16b: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2006 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)	1) 3-month program	(24,455)	4.26	5.4%	3.61	-30.7%*
	2) 9-month program	(8,235)	4.04		5.21	

\* $p = < .0001$

*DUI Incidents:* Comparable to the last six year's results, Figure 10b and Table 16b indicate that, among first DUI offenders, the 3-month program participants have significantly fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the DUI programs than do the 9-month program participants ( $p = .0001$ ). The reoffense rate of the 3-month program participants is 30.7% lower than that of the 9-month participants. Again, this finding is not surprising given that first DUI offenders assigned to the longer-term program have higher BAC levels (0.20% and above), and would be more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels.

In order to determine whether BAC level was a major factor in the outcome of the previous analysis, two further subanalyses were conducted to investigate this possibility. Among first offenders assigned to the 9-month program, 21% actually had BAC levels below 0.20% and 79% had BAC levels 0.20% and above. This difference in BAC levels allowed for conducting additional analyses comparing the outcome measures between those with BAC levels below 0.20% and those with BAC levels 0.20% and above. A second subanalysis was conducted comparing 3-month versus 9-month DUI program effects for those with BAC levels of 0.20% and above. There were a sufficient number of drivers who had BAC levels of 0.20% and above who were assigned to the 3-month program to allow for this second comparison. The results of these additional subanalyses are described below.

Results of the Evaluation of the 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels Below 0.20% Versus 0.20% and Above

Total Crashes and DUI Incidents: Table 16c shows the results of the effects of the 9-month DUI program on crashes and DUI incidents for two groups: 1) those with BAC levels below 0.20% and 2) those with BAC levels of 0.20% and above. As evident in Table 16c, first offenders with lower BAC levels had 21.1% fewer crashes than their counterparts with higher BAC levels, but differences in crash rates between the two groups approached only directional significance ( $p = .095$ ), and this finding should be viewed with caution because its tentative significance level could indicate that the difference in crash rates is due to chance alone. The previous evaluations in the past three years also did not show significant differences between the two groups on crashes. A possible explanation for this finding may be related to pre-existing crash expectancies related to differences in BAC levels.

TABLE 16c: FIRST OFFENDER 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL  
CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS  
BELOW 0.20% VERSUS 0.20% AND ABOVE

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2006 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)	1) BAC below 0.20%	(1,679)	3.18	-21.1%	3.91	-23.3%*
	2) BAC 0.20% and above	(6,295)	4.03		5.10	

\* $p = .04$

However, significant differences were apparent between these two groups on DUI incidents, substantiating the fact that those with BAC levels of 0.20% and above had more DUI incidents in the one year following their conviction than drivers with BAC levels below 0.20%. These drivers with lower BAC levels had 23.3% fewer DUI incidents than did those with BAC levels of 0.20% and above ( $p = .04$ ). The results of this analysis confirm the earlier suggestion that those with higher BAC levels are more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels, regardless of the length of time of DUI intervention program. Thus, it may not be that the 9-month programs are less effective than the 3-month programs, but rather that the 9-month programs have a higher proportion of offenders with high arrest BAC levels, who are more likely to recidivate.

Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels of 0.20% and Above

Total Crashes and DUI Incidents: As shown in Table 16d, and consistent with the past three years' results, the length of time of DUI intervention program for first DUI offenders with BAC levels of 0.20% and above had no effect on both outcome measures, 1-year subsequent crashes and DUI incidents. Although the crash and DUI incident rates for those attending the 3-month program are slightly higher than for those attending the 9-month program, the differences were not significant. Thus, with BAC level held constant, the findings of this analysis indicate that the extended 9-month DUI program has no beneficial effect relative to the 3-month DUI program among first offenders with high BAC levels on both subsequent 1-year crashes and DUI incidents. While the results of the previous analysis left unclear the relationship between recidivism and length of program or BAC level, the findings from this analysis more clearly indicate that extending the program length for first offenders with high BAC levels does not appear to reduce subsequent 1-year crashes or DUI incidents.

TABLE 16d: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI  
PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR  
DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS 0.20% AND ABOVE

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP (BAC LEVELS 0.20% AND ABOVE)	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH- INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT- INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2006 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)	1) 3-month program	(1,145)	3.81	-3.1%	5.26	4.6%
	2) 9-month program	(6,295)	3.93		5.03	

The effectiveness of increasing the duration of time for DUI intervention programs has not been supported in the literature as well. DeYoung examined the effectiveness of lengthening SB 38 alcohol treatment programs from 12 to 18 months for second offenders and found no evidence that the additional 6 months contributed to reducing DUI recidivism (DeYoung, 1995). A final limitation of these analyses should be noted. Since this study only included first offenders whose conviction abstract had information on the length of DUI program, there may be additional unknown biases that this quasi-experimental design cannot rule out. However, some statistical control of group differences removed at least part of the biases based on available covariates.

## SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Data on DMV administrative license disqualification actions (license suspension or revocation [S/R]) taken in DUI cases are presented below. These statutorily mandated actions, which are taken in cases of alcohol-impaired driving, are initiated by the receipt of either a law enforcement APS report (0.08% BAC, zero tolerance, or chemical test refusal) or court abstract of conviction. It should be noted that multiple actions can result from a single DUI incident—for example, a single DUI arrest frequently will result in both an APS suspension and a (later) mandatory postconviction suspension action.

The total count of postconviction suspension/revocation actions has dramatically increased as a result of a law change (SB 1697), effective September 20, 2005, which assigned to DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions for all DUI offenders and removed this responsibility from the courts. DMV is also responsible for issuing license restrictions to DUI offenders who meet requirements defined by the law.

This section includes the following tables:

Table 17: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1997-2007. This table shows preconviction (APS) and postconviction license disqualification totals from 1997 through 2007. The postconviction totals include juvenile suspensions, first-offender suspensions, second-offender suspensions and revocations, and third- and fourth-offender revocations.

Table 18: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measure data for fiscal years 2005/2006 through 2007/2008.



The following statements are based on the data shown in the previously listed tables.

- The total number of DMV DUI preconviction and postconviction S/R actions increased by 76.6% over that for 1997 (see Table 17). These totals have inflated as of September 20, 2005 due to the law change noted above.
- In 2007, 192,213 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 76% were first-offender actions (including actions for zero tolerance) and 24% were repeat-offender actions (see Table 17).
- In FY 2007/2008, total APS actions increased by 5.1% from FY 2006/2007, following a 5.8% increase in the previous fiscal year (see Table 18).
- The number of chemical test refusal actions increased by 2.9% in 2007, after decreasing by 3.0% in 2006. The total number of refusal actions has fallen 5.2% in the past decade (see Table 17).
- Requests for APS hearings have increased from 24.8% of all APS actions in FY 2006/2007 to 25.4% in 2007/2008. The rate at which APS S/R actions are upheld after hearing has increased slightly during the past several fiscal years, from 89.8% upheld in 2005/2006 and in 2006/2007, to 90.9% upheld in 2007/2008 (see Table 18).
- During the first 14.5 years after implementation (on January 1, 1994) of the "zero tolerance" law for minors, 232,147 suspension actions have been taken (see Table 17).

TABLE 17: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1997-2007

	YEAR										
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS	205462 <sup>1</sup>	238612 <sup>1</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242	239580	247568	339796 <sup>3</sup>	362859
PRECONVICTION											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828	168569	185481	192213
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949	19967	19374	22044	22112
.08 First-offender suspensions	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975	116022	107466	118468	123594
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413	32903	38097	41420	42979
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936	3632	3549	3528
Commercial driver actions	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853	3801	3525	2974	2903
Chemical test refusal actions	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399	9353	9599	9315	9581
.01 Test refusal suspensions	134	229	268	270	280	290	341	326	364	419	426
.08 Test refusal suspensions	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925	6091	5603	5347	5627
.08 Test refusal revocations	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936	3632	3549	3528
POSTCONVICTION <sup>2</sup>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	769 <sup>1</sup>	1026 <sup>1</sup>	918	741	714	896	794	838	737	941	1061
First-offender suspensions	4847 <sup>1</sup>	9588 <sup>1</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521	31012	39078	110525 <sup>3</sup>	124436
Misdemeanor	3834 <sup>1</sup>	7497 <sup>1</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298	28799	36808	108227 <sup>3</sup>	122102
Felony	1013 <sup>1</sup>	2091 <sup>1</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223	2213	2270	2298	2334
Second-offender S/R actions	22945 <sup>1</sup>	40238 <sup>1</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737	28400	30294	32680	34296
Misdemeanor	22532 <sup>1</sup>	39065 <sup>1</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160	27847	29699	32046	33649
Felony	413 <sup>1</sup>	633 <sup>1</sup>	485	526	577	597	577	553	595	634	647
Third-offender revocations	5569 <sup>1</sup>	9397 <sup>1</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953	5581	6720	7649	8063
Misdemeanor	5471 <sup>1</sup>	9167 <sup>1</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758	5429	6537	7424	7830
Felony	98 <sup>1</sup>	230 <sup>1</sup>	121	148	142	175	195	152	183	225	233
Fourth-offender revocations	1821 <sup>1</sup>	2998 <sup>1</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767	1921	2170	2520	2790
TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS	35951 <sup>1</sup>	63247 <sup>1</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772	67752	78999	154315 <sup>3</sup>	170646

<sup>1</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.<sup>2</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.<sup>3</sup>This count has increased as a result of the law change, effective 09/20/2005, which assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUI and removed this responsibility from the courts.

TABLE 18. ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

	7/05-6/06	7/06-6/07	7/07-6/08
Total APS actions taken (including actions later set aside)	196,691	208,106	218,776
Total .08 <sup>1</sup> APS actions set aside	16,763	17,721	16,678
Total .01 <sup>2</sup> suspensions set aside	1,369	1,415	1,302
Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside)	178,559	188,970	200,796
Net total .08 APS actions	157,602	166,544	178,501
Net total .01 suspensions	20,957	22,426	22,295
<b>Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification:<sup>3</sup></b>			
Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers	175,458	186,251	197,851
Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken	3,101	2,719	2,945
Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles	12	4	21
Net APS .08 actions for drivers with no prior DUI convictions or APS actions <sup>4</sup>	113,707	121,138	129,755
4-month license suspensions	84,983	85,599	92,283
30-day suspensions plus 5-month COE <sup>5</sup> restrictions	20,798	27,596	29,250
First-offender chemical test refusals	5,509	5,622	5,604
CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions	2,361	2,321	2,618
Net APS .08 actions taken for drivers with prior DUI convictions	43,895	45,406	48,746
Suspensions	40,284	41,904	45,085
Revocations	3,611	3,502	3,661
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures:</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions taken (including actions later set aside)	10,140	10,151	10,323
Total .08 refusal actions set aside	505	568	559
Total .01 refusal actions set aside	28	31	30
Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside)	9,607	9,552	9,734
Net total .08 refusal actions	9,222	9,159	9,266
Net total .01 refusal actions	385	382	468
Chemical test refusal rate (excluding actions later set aside)	5.16%	4.88%	4.72%
Net .08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no prior DUIs	5,509	5,622	5,604
Net .08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with prior DUIs	3,611	3,502	3,662
<b>APS Hearings<sup>6</sup></b>			
Total .08 and .01 inperson or telephone APS hearings scheduled	49,856	51,677	55,535
Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing <sup>7</sup>	25.3%	24.8%	25.4%
.08 hearings held and/or completed	45,098	47,093	50,360
.08 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	40,511	42,281	45,756
Percentage of .08 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	89.8%	89.8%	90.9%
.01 hearings held and/or completed	4,532	4,766	4,861
.01 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	4,010	4,194	4,348
Percentage of .01 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	88.5%	88.0%	89.4%
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal hearings scheduled	3,308	3,209	3,393
.08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed	3,196	3,075	3,254
.08 APS refusal actions sustained/upheld following hearings	2,758	2,665	2,883

<sup>1</sup>.08 refers to APS actions taken subsequent to obtaining evidence of a BAC equal to or in excess of the .08% per se level or on the basis of a chemical test refusal. Such an action is taken in conjunction with a DUI arrest.

<sup>2</sup>.01 refers to APS suspensions taken against drivers under the age of 21 with BACs .01% or greater, or on the basis of a chemical test refusal, and are not necessarily taken in conjunction with a DUI arrest.

<sup>3</sup>All entries in this category exclude actions later set aside but, where possible, include actions taken on the basis of either a chemical test refusal or a BAC test result.

<sup>4</sup>Prior DUI convictions or APS actions consist of any such conviction or action where the violation occurred within ten years (seven years before 1/1/05) prior to the current violation.

<sup>5</sup>This restriction allows driving to, from, and during the course-of-employment (enacted 1/1/95).

<sup>6</sup>These figures include refusal hearings but exclude Driver Safety/Investigation hearings, subsequent APS dismissal hearings and departmental reviews.

<sup>7</sup>Both numerator and denominator include those actions later set aside as a result of the hearing.

## SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL

This section presents data on alcohol-involved crashes, as compiled and reported by the California Highway Patrol. Only crashes involving injury or fatality are assessed, due to incomplete reporting of property-damage-only (PDO) crashes<sup>1</sup>. Drivers identified as being under the influence of drugs other than alcohol are also included in the "alcohol-involved crash" category, but typically comprise less than 1% of the total. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 19: DUI Arrests Associated with Reported Crashes, 1996-2006. This table shows the number of DUI arrests and percentage of DUI arrests associated with reported crashes from 1996-2006.

Table 20: 2006 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Race/Ethnicity and Sobriety Code. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of sobriety and race/ethnicity for 2006 HBD drivers involved in crashes.

Table 21: 2006 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Adjudication Status and Sobriety Code. This table cross tabulates crash sobriety codes (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition for 2006 DUI convictions associated with those crashes.

Table 22: 2006 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes With No Record of Conviction, by County and Sobriety Level. This table shows the number of HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes without a corresponding conviction, by sobriety level, by county.

Table 23: Had-been-drinking Drivers Under Age 21 Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes, 1996-2006. This table shows the total number of HBD drivers under age 21 in California. It also shows their percentage of the total count of HBD drivers in the state, over the same time period.

---

<sup>1</sup>Among 2006 DUI arrests, 30,500 were associated with a reported traffic crash, with 12,324 involving an injury or fatality, and 18,176 were PDO.

Tables 24a-24b: 2006 Had-been-drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Sex (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2006 HBD drivers in fatal and injury crashes by age and sex, both total (24a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (24b).

Table 24c: 2006 Had-been-drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Type of Crash. New this year is a table that cross tabulates type of crash by age group for HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes.

Tables 25a-25b: Sobriety Level by Prior DUI Convictions for 2006 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2006 HBD drivers involved in fatal and injury crashes by sobriety level and prior conviction status, both total (25a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (25b).

Tables 26a-26b: 2006 Had-been-drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2006 HBD drivers involved in fatal and injury crashes by number of prior convictions, both total (26a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (26b).

Table 27: 2006 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Drivers Involved in Alcohol-Related Crashes. This table shows the mean, the median and frequency distribution of BAC levels for HBD drivers involved in alcohol-related crashes in 2006.

Figure 11 (below) shows the annual percentages of traffic injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 1997 to 2007. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI summary statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.




Figure 11. Percentages of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1997-2007.

Figure 12 (below) shows the alcohol- and drug-involved fatalities from 1997 to 2007. It also shows a breakdown of the number of fatalities when only alcohol was known to be involved, when only drugs were involved, or when both alcohol and drugs were involved in the fatality.




Figure 12. Alcohol- and drug-involved total fatalities, 1997-2007.

Based on these data, the following statements can be made:

- The number of alcohol-involved traffic fatalities decreased by 6.8% in 2007, following increases of 1.5% in 2006, 7.7% in 2005, 1.2% in 2004, 2.0% in 2003, 8.3% in 2002, 6.1% in 2001, 5.4% in 2000, and 9.1% in 1999, which is the first decrease in almost a decade (see DUI Summary Statistics). The proportion of traffic fatalities which are alcohol-involved decreased to 37.5%, the first year of decrease after three consecutive years of increases (see Figure 11 and DUI Summary Statistics).
- Drug-involved fatalities show a noticeable growing trend in the past decade, increasing by almost 200%, from 253 in 1997 to 749 in 2007. However, in the past two years, the number of drug-involved fatalities decreased (by 12.8% in the last year). Also, the greatest proportion of fatalities remains alcohol-related (see Figure 12).
- 11.5% of traffic crash injuries in 2007 were alcohol-involved, relatively unchanged from 11.2% in 2006 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- The proportion of HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes under age of 21 increased from 10.3% in 1996 to 12.2% in 2006 (18.4% increase, see Table 23).
- 15.5% of all 2006 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 15.8% in 2005. 6.3% of DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly lower than 6.6% in 2005 (see Table 19).
- In 41.9% of cases where a DUI offender was arrested in connection with a fatal/injury traffic crash, there is no record of any corresponding conviction. In 56.4% of these nonconvicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers had been drinking and that their ability was impaired (see Table 21).
- Non-arrested or non-convicted drivers in alcohol-involved fatal/injury crashes in 2006 were less likely to have a prior conviction within ten years for DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving than did drivers who were arrested in conjunction with the crash (see Tables 25a and 25b).

- About two-thirds (70.7%) of arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 26a).
- Among 2006 HBD drivers in fatal/injury crashes, 33.4% were involved in crashes with fixed objects, while 53.8% were involved in multiple vehicle crashes. With increasing age, the proportion of HBD drivers in fixed object crashes declined, while the proportion of HBD drivers in multiple vehicle crashes increased (see Table 24c).

TABLE 19: DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 1996-2006

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
TOTAL DUI ARRESTS	201765	191164	188327	188523	181336	176490	177056	183560	180957	180288	197248
PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH CRASHES	12.7%	12.3%	12.9%	12.6%	13.7%	14.3%	15.0%	14.3%	14.8%	15.8%	15.5%
PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH CRASHES INVOLVING INJURIES/FATALITIES	6.1%	5.8%	5.9%	5.8%	6.4%	6.3%	6.4%	6.1%	6.2%	6.6%	6.3%



TABLE 20: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)									
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER		UNKNOWN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	21031	100.0	8827	42.0	8315	39.5	1516	7.2	1286	6.1	1087	5.2
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	16411	78.0	6973	42.5	6874	41.9	1115	6.8	938	5.7	511	3.1
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1897	9.0	616	32.5	562	29.6	145	7.6	93	4.9	481	25.4
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2723	12.9	1238	45.5	879	32.3	256	9.4	255	9.4	95	3.5

\*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2006 California Highway Patrol data files.

TABLE 21: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION									
			MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		YOUTH DUI		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTIONS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18509	100.0	8209	44.4	2031	11.0	435	2.4	78	0.4	7756	41.9
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	14895	80.5	8048	54.0	1983	13.3	422	2.8	68	0.5	4374	29.4
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1105	6.0	131	11.9	38	3.4	11	1.0	0	0.0	925	83.7
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2475	13.4	27	1.1	9	0.4	2	0.1	10	0.4	2427	98.1
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	18	0.1	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	94.4
NOT REPORTED	16	0.1	2	12.5	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	81.3

\*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2006 California Highway Patrol data files, and include only cases where the drivers license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 22: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND SOBRIETY LEVEL

COUNTY	TOTAL (100%)	SOBRIETY LEVEL					
		HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)		HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)		HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	7714	4369	56.6	918	11.9	2427	31.5
ALAMEDA	324	190	58.6	36	11.1	98	30.2
AMADOR	12	5	41.7	1	8.3	6	50.0
BUTTE	44	24	54.5	7	15.9	13	29.5
CALAVARAS	15	6	40.0	2	13.3	7	46.7
COLUSA	7	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6
CONTRA COSTA	155	95	61.3	20	12.9	40	25.8
DEL NORTE	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
EL DORADO	61	35	57.4	4	6.6	22	36.1
FRESNO	231	153	66.2	13	5.6	65	28.1
GLENN	10	6	60.0	1	10.0	3	30.0
HUMBOLDT	45	29	64.4	6	13.3	10	22.2
IMPERIAL	41	27	65.9	2	4.9	12	29.3
INYO	18	12	66.7	1	5.6	5	27.8
KERN	173	115	66.5	15	8.7	43	24.9
KINGS	38	21	55.3	6	15.8	11	28.9
LAKE	32	19	59.4	3	9.4	10	31.3
LASSEN	9	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3
LOS ANGELES	1818	945	52.0	240	13.2	633	34.8
MADERA	62	41	66.1	5	8.1	16	25.8
MARIN	48	22	45.8	3	6.3	23	47.9
MARIPOSA	7	4	57.1	0	0	3	42.9
MENDOCINO	30	19	63.3	6	20.0	5	16.7
MERCED	70	48	68.6	11	15.7	11	15.7
MODOC	3	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7
MONO	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
MONTEREY	75	44	58.7	9	12.0	22	29.3
NAPA	39	14	35.9	7	17.9	18	46.2
NEVADA	42	26	61.9	4	9.5	12	28.6
ORANGE	413	212	51.3	36	8.7	165	40.0
PLACER	52	21	40.4	10	19.2	21	40.4
PLUMAS	8	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
RIVERSIDE	503	321	63.8	41	8.2	141	28.0
SACRAMENTO	368	200	54.3	38	10.3	130	35.3
SAN BENITO	28	18	64.3	3	10.7	7	25.0
SAN BERNARDINO	628	405	64.5	78	12.4	145	23.1
SAN DIEGO	757	425	56.1	84	11.1	248	32.8
SAN FRANCISCO	127	54	42.5	13	10.2	60	47.2
SAN JOAQUIN	175	119	68.0	20	11.4	36	20.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	52	31	59.6	7	13.5	14	26.9
SAN MATEO	96	37	38.5	13	13.5	46	47.9
SANTA BARBARA	82	47	57.3	12	14.6	23	28.0
SANTA CLARA	181	91	50.3	38	21.0	52	28.7
SANTA CRUZ	40	20	50.0	8	20.0	12	30.0
SHASTA	48	27	56.3	6	12.5	15	31.3
SISKIYOU	11	7	63.6	2	18.2	2	18.2
SOLANO	67	32	47.8	7	10.4	28	41.8
SONOMA	96	51	53.1	10	10.4	35	36.5
STANISLAUS	143	93	65.0	16	11.2	34	23.8
SUTTER	25	15	60.0	1	4.0	9	36.0
TEHAMA	20	12	60.0	4	20.0	4	20.0
TRINITY	15	7	46.7	3	20.0	5	33.3
TULARE	110	57	51.8	23	20.9	30	27.3
TUOLUMNE	26	12	46.2	2	7.7	12	46.2
VENTURA	183	111	60.7	27	14.8	45	24.6
YOLO	43	29	67.4	3	7.0	11	25.6
YUBA	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

TABLE 23: HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 1996-2006

AGE		1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
TOTAL (ALL AGES)	N	21959	19277	19080	18720	19591	20530	20633	20632	20847	20818	21031
UNDER 18	N	459	407	375	354	366	375	382	376	409	351	344
	%	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.6
18-20	N	1796	1509	1608	1678	1811	1943	2016	1894	1943	1946	2226
	%	8.2	7.8	8.4	9.0	9.2	9.5	9.8	9.2	9.3	9.4	10.6
UNDER 21	N	2255	1916	1983	2032	2177	2318	2398	2270	2352	2297	2570
	%	10.3	9.9	10.4	10.9	11.1	11.3	11.6	11.0	11.3	11.0	12.2

TABLE 24a: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\* BY AGE AND SEX

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	21031	100.0	16688	79.3	4343	20.7
UNDER 18	344	1.6	271	78.8	73	21.2
18-20	2226	10.6	1753	78.8	473	21.2
21-30	8036	38.2	6405	79.7	1631	20.3
31-40	4011	19.1	3145	78.4	866	21.6
41-50	3324	15.8	2517	75.7	807	24.3
51-59	1503	7.1	1219	81.1	284	18.9
60-69	519	2.5	413	79.6	106	20.4
70 & ABOVE	261	1.2	215	82.4	46	17.6
AGE UNKNOWN	807	3.8	750	92.9	57	7.1

\*These data are derived from the 2006 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 24b: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	4851	100.0	3855	79.5	996	20.5
UNDER 18	78	1.6	62	79.5	16	20.5
18-20	391	8.1	317	81.1	74	18.9
21-30	1941	40.0	1558	80.3	383	19.7
31-40	975	20.1	779	79.9	196	20.1
41-50	810	16.7	626	77.3	184	22.7
51-59	406	8.4	323	79.6	83	20.4
60-69	141	2.9	106	75.2	35	24.8
70 & ABOVE	109	2.2	84	77.1	25	22.9

These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above, and include only cases where the drivers license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 24c: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN  
FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND TYPE OF CRASH

AGE	TOTAL	TYPE OF CRASH									
		VEH/FIXED OBJECT		VEHICLE- PEDESTRIAN		MULTIPLE VEHICLE		VEHICLE- BICYCLE		OTHER	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
TOTAL	18509	6181	33.4	378	2.0	9963	53.8	109	0.6	1878	10.1
UNDER 18	307	143	46.6	8	2.6	116	37.8	0	0.0	40	13.0
18-20	2027	909	44.8	30	1.5	890	43.9	6	0.3	192	9.5
21-30	7320	2677	36.6	102	1.4	3780	51.6	27	0.4	734	10.0
31-40	3670	1098	29.9	73	2.0	2111	57.5	26	0.7	362	9.9
41-50	3075	855	27.8	84	2.7	1774	57.7	26	0.8	336	10.9
51-60	1452	371	25.6	52	3.6	856	59.0	14	1.0	159	11.0
61-70	459	84	18.3	21	4.6	307	66.9	7	1.5	40	8.7
71 & ABOVE	199	44	22.1	8	4.0	129	64.8	3	1.5	15	7.5

TABLE 25a: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\*

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS											
			NO DUI PRIORS		ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18509	100.0	7331	39.6	8481	45.8	2063	11.1	490	2.6	144	0.8		
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	14895	80.5	4302	28.9	8032	53.9	1959	13.2	463	3.1	139	0.9		
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1105	6.0	787	71.2	233	21.1	64	5.8	17	1.5	4	0.4		
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2475	13.4	2215	89.5	211	8.5	38	1.5	10	0.4	1	0.0		
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	18	0.1	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
NOT REPORTED	16	0.1	11	68.8	3	18.8	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0		

\*These data are derived from the California Highway Patrol's files on alcohol involved crashes and include only those cases with available driver license numbers.

TABLE 25b: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)\*

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS											
			NO DUI PRIORS		ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	4851	100.0	4189	86.4	507	10.5	119	2.5	33	0.7	3	0.1		
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	1673	34.5	1364	81.5	229	13.7	61	3.6	18	1.1	1	0.1		
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	845	17.4	709	83.9	98	11.6	29	3.4	7	0.8	2	0.2		
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2307	47.6	2093	90.7	177	7.7	29	1.3	8	0.3	0	0.0		
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	14	0.3	13	92.9	1	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
NOT REPORTED	12	0.2	10	83.3	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		

\*These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

TABLE 26a: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY  
CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS\*

CRASHES	TOTAL		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS											
			NO DUI PRIORS		ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS			
	N	%												
TOTAL	18509	100.0	7331	39.6	8481	45.8	2063	11.1	490	2.6	144	0.8		
FATAL	1103**	6.0	780	70.7	254	23.0	50	4.5	16	1.5	3	0.3		
INJURY	17406	94.0	6551	37.6	8227	47.3	2013	11.6	474	2.7	141	0.8		

\*These data are derived from the California Highway Patrol's files on alcohol involved crashes and include only those cases with available driver license numbers.  
 \*\*The records of 81.0% (893) of the HBD drivers indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 26b: 2006 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES  
BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)\*

CRASHES	TOTAL		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS											
			NO DUI PRIORS		ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS			
	N	%												
TOTAL	4851	100.0	4189	86.4	507	10.5	119	2.5	33	0.7	3	0.1		
FATAL	846**	17.4	674	79.7	129	15.2	33	3.9	9	1.1	1	0.1		
INJURY	4005	82.6	3515	87.8	378	9.4	86	2.1	24	0.6	2	0.0		

\*These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

\*\*The records of 90.4% (765) of these cases indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 27: 2006 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC)  
LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES

BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	141	1.1
.01	59	0.5
.02	65	0.5
.03	87	0.7
.04	111	0.9
.05	143	1.2
.06	180	1.4
.07	238	1.9
.08	437	3.5
.09	464	3.7
.10	545	4.4
.11	557	4.5
.12	636	5.1
.13	719	5.8
.14	712	5.7
.15	719	5.8
.16	776	6.2
.17	783	6.3
.18	756	6.1
.19	663	5.3
.20	599	4.8
.21	555	4.5
.22	480	3.8
.23	400	3.2
.24	339	2.7
.25	256	2.1
.26	234	1.9
.27	206	1.7
.28	134	1.1
.29	112	0.9
.30	80	0.6
.31	68	0.5
.32	51	0.4
.33	39	0.3
.34	34	0.3
.35	25	0.2
.36	17	0.1
.37	19	0.2
.38	15	0.1
.39	7	0.1
.40	9	0.1
.41	7	0.1
.42	2	0.0
.44	1	0.0
.45	2	0.0
.47	1	0.0
.48	1	0.0
TOTAL	12484	100.0
	MEAN** BAC .16	
	MEDIAN*** BAC .16	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted alcohol-crash drivers (63.1% of the records showed BAC levels).

\*\*The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be related to drivers driving under the influence of drugs.

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

### DUI Arrest Data:

Arrest data are reported to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Criminal Justice Statistics Center, by individual law enforcement agencies throughout the state. As such, these data are subject to reporting errors such as incorrect names, birthdates or arrest dates. Nonreporting of arrest data due to error or omission can also occur; for example, in 1995 the Oakland Police Department reported no DUI arrests, after reporting 960 such arrests in 1994. In addition, when data are entered into DOJ's Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system, only the highest-order offense is included. Therefore, in cases where a DUI arrest is made in conjunction with, for example, an auto theft arrest, that DUI arrest will not be included in the database. This results in a slight but systematic underreporting of the number of DUI arrests annually.

### DUI Conviction Data:

Abstracts of conviction for DUI and other traffic-related offenses are reported to the DMV by courts throughout the state. As abstracts are received (either hard copy or through direct electronic access from the courts) they are entered onto the DMV driver record database. Abstracts without an identifying driver license number are run through the automated name index (ANI) system in order to match the abstract with an existing driver record; in cases where no such match can be made, an "X"-numbered record is created to store the abstract. The total number of DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV from the courts is tallied monthly and annually. Since this workload total includes abstracts which amend, correct or dismiss prior abstracts of conviction, it tends to overestimate the actual number of convictions which have occurred. Conviction data are also subject to reporting and nonreporting errors similar to those for DUI arrests. Although the 1993 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System documented the fact that thousands of DUI convictions appearing in court records did not appear on the DMV driver record database, an upcoming study by DMV's Justice and Government Branch will document the current level of discrepancy.

### Alcohol-Involved Crash Data:

Crash data are reported to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) by local law enforcement agencies and district offices of the CHP. As such, these data are subject to reporting and nonreporting errors similar to those occurring in both DUI arrest and conviction data. While most local law enforcement agencies will investigate and file reports on crashes involving injury or death, the investigation and reporting of property-damage-only crashes varies widely by local jurisdiction. Data are entered onto CHP's Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) and published in their annual report.



## HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975

SB 1388 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/2009, transfers regulatory authority for the administration of mandatory ignition interlock device (IID) programs from the state courts to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). This law also authorizes the DMV to require any driver convicted of driving with a suspended license, due to a prior conviction for DUI, to install an IID in any vehicle that the offender owns or operates.

SB 1190 (Oropeza), effective 1/1/2009, reduces the blood alcohol level (BAC) at which the court may require first time offenders convicted of a DUI to install an ignition interlock device (IID) from 0.20% to 0.15% at the time of arrest.

AB 2802 (Houston), effective 1/1/2009, requires the court to order a person convicted of alcohol-reckless driving to participate in a licensed DUI program for at least nine months, if that person has a prior conviction for alcohol-reckless driving or a DUI within 10 years. This law requires the court to revoke the person's probation for failure to enroll in, participate in, or complete the program. It also requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to include in the annual report to the Legislature an evaluation of the effectiveness of that program.

AB 1165 (Maze), effective 1/1/2009, authorizes law enforcement to issue a notice of suspension and impound the vehicle of a convicted DUI offender, who is on probation and is driving with a BAC of 0.01% or greater (as measured by a preliminary alcohol screen test or other chemical test).

SB 1756 (Migden), effective 1/1/2007, extends driver's license suspension from 6 to 10 months for a person convicted of a first DUI offense, who is granted probation, and whose blood alcohol level (BAC) is 0.20% or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

AB 2520 (Committee on Transportation), effective 1/1/2007, requires the DMV to immediately suspend (APS action) the commercial driver's license of a driver operating a commercial vehicle with a blood alcohol level (BAC) of 0.04% or greater.

AB 2559 (Benoit), effective 1/1/2007, reorganizes the section of the Penal Code 192 (c) (3) related to gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, to include the offense where the intoxication was a contributing factor in the killing.

AB 2752 (Spitzer), effective 1/1/2007, makes it an infraction for a person under the age of 21 to drive with any measurable (0.01% or greater) blood alcohol concentration. Persons under the age of 21 will now be subject to criminal penalties.

AB 3045 (Koretz), effective 1/1/2007, requires the DMV to verify installment of an ignition interlock device (IID) before reinstating the driving privilege, when an IID restriction is imposed by the courts.

SB 207 (Scott), effective 1/1/2006, establishes a statewide administrative vehicle impoundment program for repeat DUI offenders, when the driver's BAC level is 0.10% or more by weight, or when the driver refuses to submit to a chemical test. If the driver has one prior DUI conviction within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 5 days, and if the driver has two or more prior DUI convictions within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 15 days.

SB 547 (Cox), effective 1/1/2006, establishes a pilot program in Sacramento County that would authorize a peace officer to impound a person's vehicle for up to 30 days, if the driver has one or more prior DUI convictions within the past 10 years. Vehicle impoundment will take place in combination with a DUI intervention program established by the county. This bill shall remain operative until January 1, 2009, and would require the county to report the effectiveness of the pilot program to the Legislature.

SB 571 (Levine), effective 1/1/2006, lowers the blood alcohol level (BAC) at which the court must consider enhanced penalties from 0.20% to 0.15%, if a person is convicted of DUI.

AB 979 (Runner), effective 1/1/2006, reduces the mandatory suspension/revocation period, from a 12 to 30 month range to 12 months for repeat DUI offenders, before they become eligible to obtain a restricted driver's license. The license restriction requires the installation of an ignition interlock device (IID). This bill allows for a

mandatory 30-day vehicle impoundment period if a person is operating the vehicle in violation of the ignition interlock device restriction.

AB 1353 (Liu), effective 9/20/2005, increases the duration of DUI programs from 6 to 9 months (consisting of at least 60 hours of program activities) for first DUI offenders, who are granted probation, and whose blood alcohol content (BAC) is 0.20% or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

SB 1694 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, increases the time period from seven to ten years during which arrests and/or convictions of DUI will be counted as prior offenses for enhanced penalties (includes DUI convictions of persons under age 21). This new law also requires the court to order a person convicted of a prior DUI to complete a DUI program, even though that prior conviction occurred more than ten years ago, and authorizes the court to order the person to complete a repeat offender DUI program. Finally, it expands court-ordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all persons convicted of a repeat DUI offense within ten years of a prior offense.

SB 1696 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, requires the DUI program providers to send proof of enrollment in, or proof of completion of, the programs directly to DMV Headquarters, and prohibits the DMV from receiving the certificates from program participants.

SB 1697 (Torlakson), effective 9/20/2005, assigns sole responsibility for imposing driver license actions for DUI arrests and convictions to DMV, and removes this responsibility from the courts. It also ensures that all persons convicted of a DUI will receive a license restriction, suspension or revocation of the driving privilege.

SB 408 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2004, prohibits the DMV (for cases showing a "critical need to drive") from issuing a restricted drivers license to minors convicted of DUI with a BAC of 0.01% or greater if the minor has other zero tolerance or DUI convictions within seven years of the current violation.

AB 1078 (Jackson), effective 1/1/2002, removes the 10-year limit on certain vehicular manslaughter convictions, resulting in the permanent retention of these violations

on the driver's record. These convictions would be considered by the court as "priors" for enhancing penalties upon subsequent conviction for DUI.

AB 803 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2001, requires the court to order a person who is at least 18 years of age who is convicted of a first violation of DUI with 0.05% or more, by weight, of alcohol to attend the educational component of a licensed DUI program; upon a second or subsequent conviction, the court is required to order the person, in addition to other penalties, to attend a 30-hour DUI program. If the person's license is suspended, the DMV cannot reinstate the driving privilege until the person provides proof of having completed the program as specified.

AB 1650 (Assembly Transportation Committee), effective 1/1/2000, is a committee bill intended to deal with transportation issues more efficiently by clarifying and making technical changes. This bill authorizes the DMV to impose a driver license suspension on those convicted of DUI in a water vessel involving injury; this remedies an oversight in existing law which provides for sanctions against drivers convicted of DUI in a water vessel without injury, but does not specify sanctions for cases involving injury.

AB 762 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/1999, extends the suspension period for a second-DUI offender from 18 months to two years, but allows the second offender to serve 12 months of the license suspension period, followed by a restricted license, with continued enrollment in a DUI program and installation of an ignition interlock device; requires persons convicted of driving with a suspended or revoked license, where that suspension or revocation was based on prior DUI convictions, to install the ignition interlock device for a period not to exceed three years or until the driving privilege is reinstated, and requires DMV to study and report on the effectiveness of these devices. Judges are also encouraged to order installation of an ignition interlock device for first-time DUI offenders if there are aggravating factors such as high blood alcohol readings (0.20% or above), chemical test refusal, numerous traffic violations, or injury crashes. This law requires that upon a first DUI conviction, if a court grants probation, 1) the person's driving privilege shall be suspended for six months by the DMV, in addition to other penalties, or 2) the person may operate a motor vehicle restricted for 90 days, to and from work and DUI program, if the person establishes proof of financial responsibility and complies with other penalties and fees.

SB 24 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/1999, cleans up AB 762, AB 1916, and SB 1186. This law requires the DMV to revoke for one year the driving privilege of any ignition interlock device-restricted driver who is convicted of driving a vehicle not equipped with an ignition interlock device (IID) under authority section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under section 23246(g)] if notified by an installation facility that the driver attempted to bypass, tamper with or remove the device, or has three or more times failed to comply with calibration or servicing requirements of the device; amends certain sections to specify that completion of a DUI program equals enrollment, participation, and completion subsequent to the date of the current violation.

SB 1186 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/1999, reorganizes specified provisions relating to DUI-related statutes by amending, repealing, and/or renumbering the DUI-related sections without making substantive changes to the statutes.

SB 1176 (Johnson), effective 1/1/1999, requires that, upon a conviction of an alcohol-related reckless driving charge, the courts order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. This bill also requires an evaluation by the DMV of the effectiveness of the program and a discussion of the findings in its annual report to the Legislature.

SB 1890 (Hurt), effective 1/1/1999, deletes the choice of the urine test from the options for chemical tests relating to operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, unless both the blood and breath tests are unavailable or where there is a condition that warrants the use of the urine test.

AB 1916 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/1999, provides that the court shall, as a condition of probation, refer a first offender whose BAC level is less than 0.20%, by weight, to participate for at least three months (minimum 30 hours) or longer to a licensed education/counseling program; if the BAC level is equal to 0.20% or more, by weight, or the person refused to take a chemical test, the court shall order the person to participate for at least six months or longer in a program consisting of 45 hours of education/counseling activities; requires the DMV to submit an annual report to the

Legislature on the efficacy of the increased drug and alcohol intervention programs; requires repeat offenders who have twice failed the programs to participate in a county alcohol and drug problem assessment program, and requires each county, beginning 1/1/2000, to prepare, or contract to be prepared, an alcohol and drug assessment report on each person ordered by the court to participate in an alcohol and drug assessment program.

AB 130 (Battin), effective 1/1/1998, requires that any person guilty of a felony or misdemeanor DUI within 10 years of a prior felony offense be designated as a habitual traffic offender for a 3-year period and have their driver license revoked for four years.

SB 1177 (Johnson), effective 1/1/1998, requires that anyone convicted of a second or subsequent DUI within seven years of a separate DUI, alcohol-related reckless driving, or DUI with bodily injury violation, is ordered to enroll in, participate and complete a DUI treatment program, subject to the latest violation, as a condition of probation. The person is not to be given credit for any treatment program activities prior to the date of the current violation.

AB 1985 (Speier), effective 1/1/1997, cited as “Courtney’s Law”; provides that a person convicted of gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated and who has one or more prior convictions of vehicular manslaughter or multiple prior DUI convictions shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a term of 15 years to life. Also, any person fleeing the scene of a crime after committing specified vehicle offenses which resulted in death, serious injury, or great bodily injury is subject to an additional 5-year prison enhancement.

SB 1579 (Leonard), effective 1/1/1997, permits DMV to suspend a driver license on a first Failure to appear (FTA) for DUI, and establishes an enhanced audit and tracking system to compare DUI arrests with subsequent actions.

SB 833 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1996, permits peace officers to seize and cause the removal of a vehicle, without arresting the driver, when the vehicle was being operated by a person whose driving privilege was suspended or revoked or who had never been issued a license; requires an impounding agency to send a notice by certified, return receipt requested mail, to the legal owner of a vehicle that is impounded, and

specifies under what conditions an impounded vehicle may be released to the legal owner.

AB 321 (Connolly), effective 1/1/1995, allows juveniles cited for driving under the influence, with a BAC of 0.05% or more, by weight (Section 23140), to be charged with vehicular manslaughter (Penal Code (PC) 192) or gross vehicular manslaughter (PC 191.5) if they violate these vehicular manslaughter laws.

SB 1295 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1995, requires every person convicted of a first DUI offense to submit proof of completion of a treatment program within a time period set by the department; requires the department to suspend the driving privilege for noncompliance, prohibits reinstatement until proof of completion is received by the department; enhances the required administrative driving privilege revocation for a minor who refuses to take or fails to complete a preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test, to two years revocation for the second offense in seven years and three years revocation for the third and subsequent offenses; applies the CVC section 23140 to drivers under age 21 (previously under age 18), making it unlawful to drive with a 0.05% BAC level or greater.

SB 1758 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1995, permits a noncommercial driver, 21 years of age or older, who was arrested for a first APS DUI offense, who took a chemical test, and enrolled in an alcohol treatment program, to also obtain a restricted driver license, valid for driving to and from and during the course of that person's employment, after serving 30 days of the suspension period. The total time period for suspension/restriction shall be six months, rather than four months. Suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers who drive are subject to having their vehicles towed and impounded for 30 days. If the driver is the registered owner of the vehicle and has a prior conviction for driving while unlicensed or suspended/revoked, the vehicle is subject to forfeiture to local authorities.

AB 2639 (Friedman), effective 9/30/1994, repeals the statutes which authorized discretionary IID orders (23235), although part of the repealed statutes were incorporated into the sections establishing mandatory orders (section 23246 et seq.). Previously, the discretionary IID orders applied to all DUI offenders, but now they apply only to first DUI offenders. For third and subsequent offenders, the statutes are amended to clarify that the court must require proof of installation of the device

before issuing an order granting a restricted license. Some of the exemptions to the IID orders were revised.

SB 126 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1994, amends CVC 23161 to provide that if the court orders a 90-day restriction for a first offender, the restriction shall begin on the date of the reinstatement of the person's privilege to drive following the 4-month administrative suspension; as part of the sentencing of repeat DUI offenders, 23161 requires an ignition interlock device to remain on the vehicle for one to three years after restoration of the driving privilege; specifies that the person cannot operate a motor vehicle when the driving privilege is suspended or revoked even if the vehicle is equipped with an ignition interlock device; requires second offenders who have been suspended for 18 months to provide proof of financial responsibility and proof of successful completion of an alcohol or drug program in order to reinstate their license privilege, includes violation of 23140 for administrative suspension for minors driving with 0.05% BAC or greater.

SB 689 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1994, prohibits a person under 21 years of age from driving with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, as measured by a PAS test; violators receive a 1-year license suspension. A person under the age of 21 who refuses the PAS test will be suspended for one year.

AB 2851 (Friedman), effective 7/1/1993, requires anyone convicted of a second DUI within seven years of a prior conviction to install an IID on all their vehicles. The device must be maintained for a period of one to three years. Proof of installation must be provided to the court or probation officer within 30 days of conviction. If proof is not provided, the DMV will revoke the license for one year. Exceptions to installing a device are for medical problems, use of vehicle in emergencies, and driving the employer's vehicle during employment.

AB 3580 (Farr), effective 7/1/1993, changes the effective date of APS suspension from 45 to 30 days after the notice is given.

SB 1600 (Bergeson), effective 9/26/1992, provides that DMV is required to suspend or revoke the licenses of those who drop out of an alcohol treatment program a second time.



AB 37 (Katz), effective 1/1/1992, combines elements of the formal and informal review hearing into a single hearing for those who were suspended under the APS laws, and provides that DMV need not stay a suspension or revocation pending review, if the hearing followed suspension or revocation for refusing a chemical test for alcohol or for driving with a BAC of 0.08% or more.

SB 185 (Thompson), effective 1/1/1992, amends Section 14602 to authorize the court to order the motor vehicle impounded for up to six months for a first conviction, and up to 12 months for a second or subsequent conviction of any of the following offenses: driving with a suspended or revoked license, violation of 2800.2 or .3 (evading a peace officer in a reckless manner, causing injury or death), within seven years of a violation of 23103, 23152, 23153, or PCs 191.5 or 192(c).

AB 2040 (Farr), effective 9/28/1990, repeals previous statutes authorizing the installation of ignition interlock devices in DUI cases. This urgency statute authorizes the installation of such devices in all DUI cases, permits the court to grant subjects revoked for 3 or more DUI-related violations a restricted license after 24 months of the revocation have passed. The restricted license is conditioned on satisfactory completion of 18 months of an alcohol treatment program, submission of proof of financial responsibility, and agreement to have an ignition interlock device installed in their vehicles. Courts are authorized to reduce the minimum DUI fine to allow the person to pay the costs of the device.

SB 1150 (Lockyer), effective 7/26/1990, provides clean-up legislation for APS; lowers the BAC level from 0.10% to 0.08%, requires proof of financial responsibility to reinstate from any APS suspension or revocation action, increases sanctions for implied consent refusals (1-year license suspension for no priors or APS actions, 2-year license revocation for one prior or APS action, and 3-year revocation for two or more prior DUI offenses or APS actions), and authorizes suspension or revocation actions taken under 13353 and 13353.2 CVC to be considered as priors.

SB 1623 (Lockyer), effective 7/1/1990, establishes authority for a peace officer to serve a notice of suspension or revocation (administrative per se or APS) personally on a person arrested for a DUI offense, to take possession of the driver license for forwarding to the department, and to issue a 45-day temporary operating permit; provides for an administrative review of the order, for an administrative hearing,

and for a judicial review of the hearing, and provides for a fee, not to exceed \$100, to be assessed upon the return of the driver license.

AB 757 (Friedman), effective 1/1/1990, requires the DMV to establish and maintain a DUI data and recidivism tracking system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI. Annual reports are to be made to the Legislature.

SB 310 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990, authorizes the courts to sell the vehicles of those registered owners who are found in violation of PCs 191.5 or 192(c3), CVC 23152 which occurred within seven years of two or more convictions of 23152 or 23153, or a violation of 23153 which occurred within seven years of one or more convictions of 23152 or 23153 or the cited PC sections.

SB 408 (Leonard), effective 1/1/1990, modifies AB 7 (Hart) to establish a BAC level of 0.08% or higher as per se evidence of impaired driving.

SB 1119 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990 for vessel provisions and 1/1/1992 for commercial driver provisions, prohibits the operation of a commercial vehicle by a person with a BAC of 0.04% or above; requires a commercial vehicle driver to be ordered out of service for 24 hours if found with a BAC at or above 0.01%, but less than 0.04%; establishes separate penalties for refusing to take or complete a chemical test based on the type of vehicle involved. Under this bill, a conviction of operating a vessel while under the influence of alcohol or drugs would also be treated as a DUI prior for driver license sanctions.

SB 1344 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990, requires statewide implementation of 12-week (30-hour) first-offender alcohol education and counseling programs, and requires state licensing of such programs. This bill also adds 6 months of monitoring and follow-up to second offender programs, resulting in 18-month programs. It requires that DMV evaluate program effects on recidivism and report the findings to the Legislature.

SB 1902 (Davis), effective 1/1/1990, prohibits DMV from issuing or renewing a driver license unless the applicant agrees in writing to comply with a blood, breath, or

urine test. This bill also designates drivers convicted of a third or subsequent DUI within seven years as “habitual traffic offenders.”

AB 3134 (Harris), effective 1/1/1989, allows the 4<sup>th</sup> DUI within seven years to be charged as a felony or misdemeanor. The term of imprisonment to state prison or county jail is not less than 180 days and not more than one year. Allows for second offenders to attend either a 1-year or 30-month treatment program.

AB 3563 (Killea), effective 1/1/1989, authorizes the court to order DMV to suspend, revoke, or delay the driving privilege of a minor failing to show proof of completion of a court-ordered alcohol education program when convicted of CVC 23140.

SB 1300 (Campbell), effective 1/1/1989, amends CVC 13202.5 to allow courts to suspend the license of a person under the age of 21 (changed from age 18) for one year, or delay the driving privilege of those 13 years or older, upon conviction of various alcohol and drug offenses, including open container violations.

SB 1964 (Robbins), effective 1/1/1989, requires all first DUI offenders to file proof of insurance when applying for a restricted license or for reinstatement of the driving privilege following a period of license suspension.

SB 885 (Royce), effective 1/1/1988, requires that a person who was granted probation for a second DUI offense to show proof of financial responsibility in order to be eligible for the 1-year restricted license.

SB 1365 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1988, establishes a 30-month alcohol treatment program as an alternative to the 12-month program for third and subsequent DUI offenders, in counties where such a program exists. In these cases, imprisonment in the county jail shall be imposed for at least 30 days, but not more than one year, in lieu of the 120-day minimum jail term.

AB 2558 (Duffy), effective 1/1/1987, provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable in the state prison for 4, 6, or 10 years. Former PC 192(c3) was deleted and incorporated into 191.5(a).

AB 2831 (Killea), effective 1/1/1987, makes it unlawful for a minor to drive with a BAC of 0.05% or more (CVC 23140). A conviction of this violation requires completion of an alcohol education program or alcohol-related community service program.

SB 2206 (Watson), effective 1/1/1987, authorizes a county to develop and administer an alcohol and drug problem-assessment program, which could include a pre-sentence alcohol and drug problem-assessment report for persons convicted under CVC 23152 or 23153, and referral to treatment program with follow-up tracking.

SB 2344 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1987, extends the sentencing period for prior DUIs from five to seven years, and specifies a 3- to 5-year probation term for a DUI conviction.

SB 3939 (Farr), effective 1/1/1987, authorizes courts to order the installation of IID for repeat offenders in four counties, and establishes a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of the devices.

SB 925 (Seymour), effective 7/1/1986, extends the period of license suspension for second-misdemeanor offenders from one year to 18 months, and also requires that offenders with three or more DUI convictions show proof of treatment completion in order to have their licenses reinstated.

AB 144 (Naylor), effective 9/29/1985, requires the court to take into consideration in a DUI case a blood alcohol concentration of 0.20% percent or above, or a refusal to take a chemical test, as special factors in the enhancing of penalties for sentencing or to impose additional terms and conditions of probation.

SB 1441 (Petrus), effective 1/1/1985, requires a 3-year license revocation for persons with two or more DUI or alcohol-related reckless convictions within five years of refusing a chemical test.

SB 1522 (Alquist), effective 1/1/1985, retains existing law for first offenders, which authorizes courts to impound a vehicle at the registered owner's expense for up to 30 days if the driver was convicted of DUI pursuant to CVC 23152 or 23153. The same time period for impoundment is required for second offenses within five years. For third and subsequent offenses, the vehicle can be impounded at the

registered owner's expense for up to 90 days. Exceptions to the required impoundment arise "where the interests of justice would best be served by not ordering impoundment." Another limitation is that no vehicle driven by a class 3 or 4 licensee is subject to impoundment if another person has a community property interest in the vehicle, and it is the only vehicle available to the driver's family.

AB 624 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/1984, requires a 1-year license revocation for minors (up to age 18) for a DUI conviction (Sections 23152, 23153 CVC).

SB 1601 (Sieroty), effective 7/1/1982, modifies AB 541 provisions by requiring that SB 38 participants establish proof of insurance in order to remove the license restriction at the end of six months. In addition, SB 38 participants who dropped out of the program are given two more opportunities to reenroll, instead of receiving an immediate license suspension. Program providers are also required to report dropouts directly to DMV.

AB 7 (Hart), effective 1/1/1982, makes it a misdemeanor under CVC 23152(b) to drive a vehicle with a BAC level of 0.10% or higher. Drivers with lower BAC levels (0.05%-0.09%) can be convicted of DUI when sufficient behavioral evidence of impairment is apparent.

AB 541 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/1982, establishes that under CVC 23152(a), driving under the influence of an alcoholic beverage or drugs or their combined influence is a misdemeanor, while felony charges are filed under CVC 23153, and alcohol-related reckless charges are filed under CVC 23103.5. A conviction under 23103.5 constitutes a prior for a second offense (but not for third offenses). The penalties imposed are a 90-day license restriction (work- and treatment-related driving only) and referral to an alcohol education program for most first offenders; a 1-year license restriction for second offenders who enroll in an approved 12-month alcohol treatment (SB 38) program. First offenders not placed on probation receive a 6-month license suspension. Second offenders not assigned to an alcohol program are suspended for one year. A minimum jail term of 48 hours is mandatory for all repeat offenders, and a minimum fine of \$390 is assessed for all DUI offenses. Offenders with three or more DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving convictions receive a 3-year license revocation along with a jail term and fine, and a small proportion are referred to a 12-month SB 38 program. Enrollment in the program

cannot be substituted for license revocation. The period defining prior DUIs changes from seven to five years. Convictions of a DUI offense with bodily injury or fatality, when prosecuted as a felony, continue to result in more severe penalties (such as longer license actions and jail terms) than the misdemeanor offenses. The only change in the 1982 law for felony second offenders is that those participating in the SB 38 program will receive a license suspension for one year and a license restriction for two years.

SB 38 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/1978, extends the pilot 12-month alcohol treatment program for repeat offenders statewide.

SB 330 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/1976, permits repeat DUI offenders in four counties to participate in a 12-month pilot alcohol treatment program in lieu of the usual 12-month suspension or 3-year revocation.

## REFERENCES

- Automobile Club of Southern California, California Highway Patrol, California State Automobile Association, & Department of Motor Vehicles. (2005). *Digest of Traffic Legislation*. Sacramento: Authors.
- California Department of Motor Vehicles. (1984-87). *An evaluation of the California drunk driving countermeasure system. Volumes 1-8*. Sacramento: Author.
- California Highway Patrol. (2003). *2003 annual report of fatal and injury motor vehicle traffic collisions*. Sacramento: Author.
- DeYoung, D. J. (1995). *An evaluation of the effectiveness of California drinking driver programs* (Report No. 146). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- DeYoung, D. J. (1997). *An evaluation of the specific deterrent effect of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked and unlicensed drivers in California* (Report No. 171). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- DeYoung, D. J., Peck, R. C., & Helander, C. J. (1999). Estimating the exposure and fatal crash rates of suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers in California. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 29(1), 17-23.
- Helander, C. J. (1989). *Development of a California DUI management information system* (Report No. 121). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. (1995, September). DUI legislation 1982-1995. *The 1995 Judicial DUI Seminar*. Presented by the Committee on Drinking Drivers of the Municipal Court Judges Association and the Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. Oxnard, California.
- Peck, R. C. (1991). The general and specific deterrent effects of DUI sanctions: A review of California's experience. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving*, 7(1), 13-42.

- Peck, R. C. (1993, January). *California DMV's driving under the influence R&D program: Some recent findings and activities*. Paper presented at the 72<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Session 86A. Washington DC.
- Rogers, P. N. (1997). *The specific deterrent impact of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws. Volume 2 of an evaluation of the effectiveness of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws* (Report No. 167). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1992). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 134). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1994). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 143). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1995). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 145). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1996). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 159). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1997). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 165). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1998). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 169). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.



- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1999). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 179). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2000). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 185). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2001). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 188). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2002). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 191). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2003). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 198). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2004). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 206). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2005). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 211). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., Marowitz, L. A., DeYoung, D. J., & Helander, C. J. (1993). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 138). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2006). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 220). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2007). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 222). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2008). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 224). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

Tashima, H. N., & Peck, R. C. (1986). *An evaluation of the specific deterrent effects of alternative sanctions for first and repeat DUI offenders: Vol. 3 of an evaluation of the California drunk driving countermeasure system* (Report No. 95). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

## GLOSSARY

### ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE (APS)

Administrative per se ("on-the-spot") license suspension or revocation occurs immediately pursuant to lawful arrest of a person driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08% or more, or one who refuses a chemical test. Upon arrest, the driver's license is immediately confiscated by the law enforcement officer and an order of suspension or revocation served. The driver is issued a temporary license and allowed due process through administrative review. In July 1990, California became the 28th state to implement APS. In January 1994, California enacted a "zero tolerance" statute which requires the administrative suspension of any driver under age 21 with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, or who refuses to be tested.

### ALCOHOL-INVOLVED CRASH

Alcohol-involved crashes are those in which the investigating law enforcement officer indicates on the crash report that the driver "had-been-drinking (HBD)." Crashes involving drivers who are determined to be under the influence of drugs other than alcohol (typically less than 1% of all crashes) are also included in the alcohol-involved crash category.

### ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

Commonly called a "wet" reckless, alcohol-related reckless driving refers to an arrest/conviction incident which originated as a DUI arrest. DUI arrests involving drugs which are reduced to reckless driving are also referred to as alcohol-involved or "wet" reckless driving. "Wet" reckless convictions count as priors for the purposes of enhanced penalties upon subsequent conviction of DUI.

### ALPHA

Alpha is the investigator's acceptable risk or probability level of making a Type 1 error (generally chosen to be small—e.g., .01, .05). There is always some risk of a Type 1 error, so alpha cannot be zero. Alpha is also called the significance level, because it is the criterion for claiming statistical significance.

### BAC

Blood alcohol concentration, or BAC, is a measure of the percent, by weight, of alcohol in a person's blood. Statutorily, BAC is based upon grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or per 210 liters of breath.

### CONVICTION

Conviction of an offense, as used in this report, refers to the receipt by DMV of a court abstract of conviction. In a small proportion of cases, an offender may be convicted of an offense but that conviction is not reported to DMV. Such cases would functionally be treated by DMV as though the offender had not been convicted. Because convictions can be amended, corrected, dismissed or simply not reported at all, the conviction totals reported herein are dynamic and subject to change.

### COVARIATE

A variable used to statistically adjust the results of an analysis for differences (on that variable) existing among subjects prior to the comparison of treatment effects.

### DUI

DUI is an acronym for "driving under the influence" of alcohol and/or drugs, a violation of Sections 23152, 23153, 23140, of the California Vehicle Code, Penal Codes 191.5a, b, 192.3c, d, US Codes J36FR46, J36423, and out of state DUI codes.

### DUI CONVICTION RATE

Percent of DUI convictions divided by the number of DUI arrests (based on year of arrest).

### LOGISTIC REGRESSION

Logistic regression analysis is a statistical procedure evaluating the linear relationship between various factors and the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an outcome event. In this study, the procedure was used to explain the relationship between the various sanctions and the proportion of DUI offenders who incurred crashes and/or DUI incidents.

### MAJOR CONVICTION

Major convictions include primarily DUI convictions, but also reckless driving and hit-and-run convictions.

### MEAN

Arithmetic average computed by adding up all the values and dividing them by the number of values.

### MEDIAN

The median is the midpoint in a set of values arranged from lowest to highest, so that half of the values are below and half are above.

$p$

$p$  stands for probability. For example, if  $p < .05$ , the probability is less than 5 chances in 100 that the difference found is by chance alone.

### QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

Quasi-experimental designs refer to analyses where the comparison groups are not equivalent on characteristics other than the treatment conditions because random assignment was not used. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results because of possible confounding of group bias with treatment effects. Covariates are used to statistically reduce group differences prior to the comparison of treatment effects.

### STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

If the result of a statistical test is significant, this means that the difference found is very unlikely by chance alone.

## APPENDIX A

### Assembly Bill No. 757

#### CHAPTER 450

An act to add Section 1821 to the Vehicle Code, relating to driving offenses.

(Approved by Governor September 14, 1989. Filed with Secretary of State September 15, 1989.)

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 757, Friedman. Driving offenses: intervention programs: evaluation.

Under existing law, the Department of Motor Vehicles maintains records of driver's offenses reported by the courts. Including violations of the prohibitions against driving while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage, any drug, or both, driving with an excessive blood-alcohol concentration, or driving while addicted to any drug.

This bill would, additionally, require the department to establish and maintain a data and monitoring system, as specified, to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of those violations relating to alcohol and drugs, and to report thereon annually to the Legislature.

The bill would declare legislative findings.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares as follows:

(a) Drivers under the influence of drugs or alcohol continue to present a grave danger to the citizens of this state.

(b) The Legislature has taken stern action to deter this crime and punish its offenders and has provided a range of sanctions available to the courts to use at their discretion.

(c) No system exists to monitor and evaluate the efficacy of these measures or to determine the achievement of the Legislature's goals.

(d) This lack of accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics hampers the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions.

(e) It is essential that the Legislature acquire this information, from available resources, as soon as practicable, and that this information be updated and transmitted annually to the Legislature.

SEC. 2. Section 1821 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read:

1821: The department shall establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The system may include a recidivism tracking system. The recidivism tracking system may include, but not be limited to, jail sentencing, license restriction, license suspension. Level I (first offender) and II (multiple offender) alcohol and drug education and treatment program assignment, alcohol and drug education treatment program readmission

and dropout rates, adjudicating court, length of jail term, actual jail or alternative sentence served, type of treatment program assigned, actual program compliance status, subsequent accidents related to driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and subsequent convictions of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The department shall submit an annual report of its evaluations to the Legislature. The evaluations shall include a ranking of the relative efficacy of criminal penalties, other sanctions, and intervention programs and the various combinations thereof.

O

## APPENDIX B

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)								
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STATEWIDE		203866	165439	81.2	38427	18.8	81435	39.9	93474	45.9	14627	7.2	14330	7.0	
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	35	24	68.6	11	31.4	19	54.3	9	25.7	6	17.1	1	2.9	
	18-20	587	458	78.0	129	22.0	213	36.3	203	34.6	94	16.0	77	13.1	
	21-30	3319	2667	80.4	652	19.6	887	26.7	1352	40.7	622	18.7	458	13.8	
	31-40	1733	1408	81.2	325	18.8	441	25.4	695	40.1	400	23.1	197	11.4	
	41-50	1199	949	79.1	250	20.9	477	39.8	305	25.4	300	25.0	117	9.8	
	51-60	484	396	81.8	88	18.2	235	48.6	65	13.4	132	27.3	52	10.7	
	61-70	121	98	81.0	23	19.0	57	47.1	14	11.6	34	28.1	16	13.2	
	71 & ABOVE	40	30	75.0	10	25.0	23	57.5	2	5.0	11	27.5	4	10.0	
	TOTAL	7518	6030	80.2	1488	19.8	2352	31.3	2645	35.2	1599	21.3	922	12.3	
ALPINE	21-30	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	31-40	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	41-50	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	51-60	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	
	61-70	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	TOTAL	19	15	78.9	4	21.1	16	84.2	0	0.0	1	5.3	2	10.5	
	AMADOR	UNDER18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
		18-20	27	24	88.9	3	11.1	21	77.8	4	14.8	0	0.0	2	7.4
		21-30	82	63	76.8	19	23.2	65	79.3	14	17.1	0	0.0	3	3.7
31-40		71	56	78.9	15	21.1	50	70.4	18	25.4	1	1.4	2	2.8	
41-50		96	65	67.7	31	32.3	87	90.6	7	7.3	0	0.0	2	2.1	
51-60		53	41	77.4	12	22.6	49	92.5	4	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	
61-70		12	8	66.7	4	33.3	10	83.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	0	0.0	
71 & ABOVE		1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
TOTAL		345	261	75.7	84	24.3	286	82.9	48	13.9	2	0.6	9	2.6	
BUTTE	UNDER18	35	27	77.1	8	22.9	31	88.6	4	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	18-20	187	155	82.9	32	17.1	139	74.3	30	16.0	10	5.3	8	4.3	
	21-30	769	675	87.8	94	12.2	597	77.6	131	17.0	15	2.0	26	3.4	
	31-40	335	283	84.5	52	15.5	249	74.3	54	16.1	18	5.4	14	4.2	
	41-50	366	276	75.4	90	24.6	310	84.7	39	10.7	10	2.7	7	1.9	
	51-60	182	153	84.1	29	15.9	161	88.5	15	8.2	5	2.7	1	0.5	
	61-70	54	43	79.6	11	20.4	50	92.6	1	1.9	1	1.9	2	3.7	
	71 & ABOVE	10	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1938	1621	83.6	317	16.4	1547	79.8	274	14.1	59	3.0	58	3.0	



TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	26	22	84.6	4	15.4	24	92.3	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	3.8
	21-30	100	86	86.0	14	14.0	85	85.0	11	11.0	1	1.0	3	3.0
	31-40	78	61	78.2	17	21.8	65	83.3	11	14.1	1	1.3	1	1.3
	41-50	74	49	66.2	25	33.8	67	90.5	6	8.1	0	0.0	1	1.4
	51-60	57	48	84.2	9	15.8	52	91.2	4	7.0	1	1.8	0	0.0
	61-70	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	360	286	79.4	74	20.6	317	88.1	33	9.2	4	1.1	6	1.7
COLUSA	UNDER 18	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	27	23	85.2	4	14.8	12	44.4	14	51.9	0	0.0	1	3.7
	21-30	94	86	91.5	8	8.5	27	28.7	59	62.8	3	3.2	5	5.3
	31-40	56	40	71.4	16	28.6	22	39.3	31	55.4	0	0.0	3	5.4
	41-50	60	46	76.7	14	23.3	39	65.0	20	33.3	0	0.0	1	1.7
	51-60	33	28	84.8	5	15.2	23	69.7	7	21.2	1	3.0	2	6.1
	61-70	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	283	234	82.7	49	17.3	132	46.6	135	47.7	4	1.4	12	4.2
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	54	37	68.5	17	31.5	39	72.2	11	20.4	1	1.9	3	5.6
	18-20	397	323	81.4	74	18.6	190	47.9	140	35.3	24	6.0	43	10.8
	21-30	1834	1437	78.4	397	21.6	690	37.6	732	39.9	256	14.0	156	8.5
	31-40	889	718	80.8	171	19.2	328	36.9	346	38.9	148	16.6	67	7.5
	41-50	723	552	76.3	171	23.7	370	51.2	179	24.8	130	18.0	44	6.1
	51-60	318	252	79.2	66	20.8	187	58.8	54	17.0	59	18.6	18	5.7
	61-70	84	69	82.1	15	17.9	55	65.5	8	9.5	14	16.7	7	8.3
	71 & ABOVE	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	11	73.3	0	0.0	3	20.0	1	6.7
	TOTAL	4314	3401	78.8	913	21.2	1870	43.3	1470	34.1	635	14.7	339	7.9
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	31	25	80.6	6	19.4	24	77.4	4	12.9	1	3.2	2	6.5
	21-30	106	77	72.6	29	27.4	81	76.4	13	12.3	2	1.9	10	9.4
	31-40	59	46	78.0	13	22.0	49	83.1	4	6.8	1	1.7	5	8.5
	41-50	66	52	78.8	14	21.2	54	81.8	5	7.6	0	0.0	7	10.6
	51-60	34	29	85.3	5	14.7	32	94.1	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	8	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	308	237	76.9	71	23.1	252	81.8	28	9.1	4	1.3	24	7.8

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	17	12	70.6	5	29.4	14	82.4	1	5.9	2	11.8	0	0.0
	18-20	94	78	83.0	16	17.0	74	78.7	15	16.0	5	5.3	0	0.0
	21-30	423	343	81.1	80	18.9	343	81.1	67	15.8	3	0.7	10	2.4
	31-40	223	169	75.8	54	24.2	183	82.1	26	11.7	3	1.3	11	4.9
	41-50	302	199	65.9	103	34.1	275	91.1	19	6.3	3	1.0	5	1.7
	51-60	138	99	71.7	39	28.3	134	97.1	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7
	61-70	28	22	78.6	6	21.4	25	89.3	3	10.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	9	90.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1235	929	75.2	306	24.8	1057	85.6	134	10.9	17	1.4	27	2.2
FRESNO	UNDER 18	62	50	80.6	12	19.4	25	40.3	30	48.4	2	3.2	5	8.1
	18-20	702	595	84.8	107	15.2	170	24.2	457	65.1	32	4.6	43	6.1
	21-30	3459	2950	85.3	509	14.7	707	20.4	2436	70.4	127	3.7	189	5.5
	31-40	1662	1414	85.1	248	14.9	315	19.0	1193	71.8	87	5.2	67	4.0
	41-50	1221	1012	82.9	209	17.1	326	26.7	747	61.2	94	7.7	54	4.4
	51-60	478	395	82.6	83	17.4	184	38.5	233	48.7	37	7.7	24	5.0
	61-70	106	91	85.8	15	14.2	47	44.3	47	44.3	7	6.6	5	4.7
	71 & ABOVE	23	20	87.0	3	13.0	11	47.8	9	39.1	2	8.7	1	4.3
	TOTAL	7713	6527	84.6	1186	15.4	1785	23.1	5152	66.8	388	5.0	388	5.0
GLENN	UNDER 18	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	61	51	83.6	10	16.4	29	47.5	30	49.2	0	0.0	2	3.3
	21-30	194	167	86.1	27	13.9	82	42.3	103	53.1	4	2.1	5	2.6
	31-40	137	112	81.8	25	18.2	67	48.9	61	44.5	3	2.2	6	4.4
	41-50	99	80	80.8	19	19.2	72	72.7	23	23.2	1	1.0	3	3.0
	51-60	31	27	87.1	4	12.9	16	51.6	11	35.5	2	6.5	2	6.5
	61-70	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	539	451	83.7	88	16.3	278	51.6	233	43.2	10	1.9	18	3.3
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	13	9	69.2	4	30.8	8	61.5	4	30.8	0	0.0	1	7.7
	18-20	109	82	75.2	27	24.8	89	81.7	8	7.3	1	0.9	11	10.1
	21-30	610	458	75.1	152	24.9	495	81.1	48	7.9	12	2.0	55	9.0
	31-40	296	223	75.3	73	24.7	235	79.4	21	7.1	8	2.7	32	10.8
	41-50	247	185	74.9	62	25.1	216	87.4	11	4.5	9	3.6	11	4.5
	51-60	158	120	75.9	38	24.1	136	86.1	6	3.8	4	2.5	12	7.6
	61-70	33	25	75.8	8	24.2	28	84.8	2	6.1	0	0.0	3	9.1
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	8	88.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
	TOTAL	1475	1111	75.3	364	24.7	1215	82.4	100	6.8	34	2.3	126	8.5

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	11	7	63.6	4	36.4	2	18.2	9	81.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	154	124	80.5	30	19.5	30	19.5	121	78.6	0	0.0	3	1.9
	21-30	526	436	82.9	90	17.1	130	24.7	359	68.3	14	2.7	23	4.4
	31-40	311	261	83.9	50	16.1	52	16.7	233	74.9	11	3.5	15	4.8
	41-50	232	192	82.8	40	17.2	65	28.0	150	64.7	8	3.4	9	3.9
	51-60	115	101	87.8	14	12.2	32	27.8	80	69.6	2	1.7	1	0.9
	61-70	43	42	97.7	1	2.3	22	51.2	20	46.5	0	0.0	1	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	6	66.7	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	11.1
	TOTAL	1401	1170	83.5	231	16.5	339	24.2	974	69.5	35	2.5	53	3.8
INYO	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	25	22	88.0	3	12.0	11	44.0	8	32.0	0	0.0	6	24.0
	21-30	76	62	81.6	14	18.4	41	53.9	18	23.7	0	0.0	17	22.4
	31-40	56	47	83.9	9	16.1	34	60.7	11	19.6	0	0.0	11	19.6
	41-50	63	43	68.3	20	31.7	53	84.1	5	7.9	1	1.6	4	6.3
	51-60	58	48	82.8	10	17.2	53	91.4	2	3.4	0	0.0	3	5.2
	61-70	12	9	75.0	3	25.0	12	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	295	235	79.7	60	20.3	208	70.5	45	15.3	1	0.3	41	13.9
KERN	UNDER 18	54	47	87.0	7	13.0	25	46.3	24	44.4	4	7.4	1	1.9
	18-20	557	479	86.0	78	14.0	209	37.5	312	56.0	22	3.9	14	2.5
	21-30	2349	1990	84.7	359	15.3	731	31.1	1460	62.2	117	5.0	41	1.7
	31-40	1228	1031	84.0	197	16.0	386	31.4	721	58.7	95	7.7	26	2.1
	41-50	945	731	77.4	214	22.6	422	44.7	423	44.8	78	8.3	22	2.3
	51-60	349	300	86.0	49	14.0	186	53.3	122	35.0	30	8.6	11	3.2
	61-70	102	86	84.3	16	15.7	64	62.7	23	22.5	7	6.9	8	7.8
	71 & ABOVE	22	15	68.2	7	31.8	15	68.2	7	31.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	5606	4679	83.5	927	16.5	2038	36.4	3092	55.2	353	6.3	123	2.2
KINGS	UNDER 18	12	12	100.0	0	0.0	5	41.7	7	58.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	88	79	89.8	9	10.2	28	31.8	56	63.6	1	1.1	3	3.4
	21-30	551	459	83.3	92	16.7	158	28.7	355	64.4	25	4.5	13	2.4
	31-40	228	185	81.1	43	18.9	62	27.2	144	63.2	17	7.5	5	2.2
	41-50	147	118	80.3	29	19.7	45	30.6	82	55.8	13	8.8	7	4.8
	51-60	64	55	85.9	9	14.1	26	40.6	29	45.3	9	14.1	0	0.0
	61-70	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1106	922	83.4	184	16.6	335	30.3	677	61.2	66	6.0	28	2.5

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LAKE	UNDER 18	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	29	25	86.2	4	13.8	21	72.4	8	27.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	136	114	83.8	22	16.2	86	63.2	40	29.4	2	1.5	8	5.9
	31-40	110	92	83.6	18	16.4	78	70.9	24	21.8	1	0.9	7	6.4
	41-50	124	94	75.8	30	24.2	114	91.9	7	5.6	1	0.8	2	1.6
	51-60	80	57	71.3	23	28.7	71	88.8	4	5.0	4	5.0	1	1.2
	61-70	24	21	87.5	3	12.5	21	87.5	0	0.0	2	8.3	1	4.2
	71 & ABOVE	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
LASSEN	TOTAL	517	414	80.1	103	19.9	405	78.3	83	16.1	10	1.9	19	3.7
	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
	18-20	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	14	87.5	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	59	48	81.4	11	18.6	46	78.0	10	16.9	0	0.0	3	5.1
	31-40	41	32	78.0	9	22.0	33	80.5	6	14.6	1	2.4	1	2.4
	41-50	55	43	78.2	12	21.8	52	94.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.5
	51-60	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	24	85.7	1	3.6	1	3.6	2	7.1
	61-70	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	217	172	79.3	45	20.7	186	85.7	19	8.8	2	0.9	10	4.6
	UNDER 18	153	109	71.2	44	28.8	72	47.1	65	42.5	4	2.6	12	7.8
	18-20	2777	2209	79.5	568	20.5	757	27.3	1649	59.4	149	5.4	222	8.0
	21-30	17986	14484	80.5	3502	19.5	3993	22.2	10748	59.8	1406	7.8	1839	10.2
	31-40	10357	8865	85.6	1492	14.4	2078	20.1	6192	59.8	1216	11.7	871	8.4
	41-50	6629	5584	84.2	1045	15.8	1761	26.6	3442	51.9	941	14.2	485	7.3
	51-60	2616	2275	87.0	341	13.0	935	35.7	1026	39.2	424	16.2	231	8.8
MADERA	61-70	648	566	87.3	82	12.7	257	39.7	214	33.0	127	19.6	50	7.7
	71 & ABOVE	120	107	89.2	13	10.8	57	47.5	38	31.7	20	16.7	5	4.2
	TOTAL	41286	34199	82.8	7087	17.2	9910	24.0	23374	56.6	4287	10.4	3715	9.0
	UNDER 18	14	14	100.0	0	0.0	3	21.4	11	78.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	83	71	85.5	12	14.5	18	21.7	60	72.3	1	1.2	4	4.8
	21-30	425	371	87.3	54	12.7	100	23.5	304	71.5	10	2.4	11	2.6
	31-40	217	189	87.1	28	12.9	56	25.8	150	69.1	5	2.3	6	2.8
	41-50	199	147	73.9	52	26.1	84	42.2	103	51.8	5	2.5	7	3.5
	51-60	77	61	79.2	16	20.8	46	59.7	24	31.2	2	2.6	5	6.5
	61-70	21	20	95.2	1	4.8	12	57.1	7	33.3	0	0.0	2	9.5
	71 & ABOVE	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	6	85.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
	TOTAL	1043	878	84.2	165	15.8	325	31.2	659	63.2	23	2.2	36	3.5

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIN	UNDER 18	13	13	100.0	0	0.0	9	69.2	3	23.1	1	7.7	0	0.0
	18-20	102	81	79.4	21	20.6	59	57.8	36	35.3	3	2.9	4	3.9
	21-30	607	487	80.2	120	19.8	277	45.6	266	43.8	18	3.0	46	7.6
	31-40	355	281	79.2	74	20.8	182	51.3	123	34.6	28	7.9	22	6.2
	41-50	308	220	71.4	88	28.6	235	76.3	44	14.3	15	4.9	14	4.5
	51-60	162	124	76.5	38	23.5	143	88.3	7	4.3	4	2.5	8	4.9
	61-70	71	54	76.1	17	23.9	60	84.5	8	11.3	2	2.8	1	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	15	12	80.0	3	20.0	12	80.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	1	6.7
	TOTAL	1633	1272	77.9	361	22.1	977	59.8	489	29.9	71	4.3	96	5.9
MARIPOSA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	11	7	63.6	4	36.4	9	81.8	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	9.1
	21-30	39	33	84.6	6	15.4	28	71.8	4	10.3	1	2.6	6	15.4
	31-40	34	26	76.5	8	23.5	28	82.4	6	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	32	22	68.8	10	31.3	25	78.1	4	12.5	1	3.1	2	6.3
	51-60	28	25	89.3	3	10.7	23	82.1	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	10.7
	61-70	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.6
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	153	122	79.7	31	20.3	120	78.4	17	11.1	2	1.3	14	9.2
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	14	8	57.1	6	42.9	11	78.6	3	21.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	84	69	82.1	15	17.9	48	57.1	27	32.1	1	1.2	8	9.5
	21-30	352	284	80.7	68	19.3	207	58.8	119	33.8	6	1.7	20	5.7
	31-40	211	162	76.8	49	23.2	139	65.9	47	22.3	6	2.8	19	9.0
	41-50	190	138	72.6	52	27.4	142	74.7	33	17.4	2	1.1	13	6.8
	51-60	128	103	80.5	25	19.5	107	83.6	13	10.2	4	3.1	4	3.1
	61-70	34	28	82.4	6	17.6	29	85.3	2	5.9	2	5.9	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1019	798	78.3	221	21.7	689	67.6	244	23.9	21	2.1	65	6.4
MERCED	UNDER 18	22	17	77.3	5	22.7	9	40.9	13	59.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	227	196	86.3	31	13.7	54	23.8	155	68.3	9	4.0	9	4.0
	21-30	867	767	88.5	100	11.5	170	19.6	642	74.0	22	2.5	33	3.8
	31-40	446	379	85.0	67	15.0	95	21.3	323	72.4	21	4.7	7	1.6
	41-50	324	263	81.2	61	18.8	107	33.0	182	56.2	22	6.8	13	4.0
	51-60	126	108	85.7	18	14.3	52	41.3	55	43.7	12	9.5	7	5.6
	61-70	25	24	96.0	1	4.0	16	64.0	7	28.0	1	4.0	1	4.0
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2046	1763	86.2	283	13.8	508	24.8	1379	67.4	89	4.3	70	3.4

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MODOC	18-20	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	25	18	72.0	7	28.0	17	68.0	5	20.0	0	0.0	3	12.0
	31-40	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	13	72.2	5	27.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	27	18	66.7	9	33.3	21	77.8	5	18.5	0	0.0	1	3.7
	51-60	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	8	66.7	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	16.7
	61-70	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	93	70	75.3	23	24.7	67	72.0	20	21.5	0	0.0	6	6.5
	UNDER 18	1	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MONO	21-30	60	55	91.7	5	8.3	43	71.7	13	21.7	0	0.0	4	6.7
	31-40	32	27	84.4	5	15.6	20	62.5	7	21.9	0	0.0	5	15.6
	41-50	42	31	73.8	11	26.2	35	83.3	4	9.5	0	0.0	3	7.1
	51-60	23	16	69.6	7	30.4	21	91.3	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	4.3
	61-70	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	167	137	82.0	30	18.0	128	76.6	26	15.6	0	0.0	13	7.8
	UNDER 18	21	19	90.5	2	9.5	6	28.6	14	66.7	1	4.8	0	0.0
	18-20	279	245	87.8	34	12.2	58	20.8	203	72.8	10	3.6	8	2.9
	21-30	1525	1341	87.9	184	12.1	288	18.9	1151	75.5	49	3.2	37	2.4
MONTEREY	31-40	597	521	87.3	76	12.7	139	23.3	420	70.4	22	3.7	16	2.7
	41-50	350	289	82.6	61	17.4	147	42.0	176	50.3	19	5.4	8	2.3
	51-60	204	159	77.9	45	22.1	129	63.2	61	29.9	8	3.9	6	2.9
	61-70	60	49	81.7	11	18.3	42	70.0	12	20.0	6	10.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	10	10	100.0	0	0.0	6	60.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3046	2633	86.4	413	13.6	815	26.8	2040	67.0	116	3.8	75	2.5
	UNDER 18	15	12	80.0	3	20.0	6	40.0	8	53.3	1	6.7	0	0.0
	18-20	109	94	86.2	15	13.8	40	36.7	61	56.0	3	2.8	5	4.6
	21-30	424	348	82.1	76	17.9	177	41.7	228	53.8	4	0.9	15	3.5
	31-40	261	207	79.3	54	20.7	141	54.0	103	39.5	7	2.7	10	3.8
NAPA	41-50	179	134	74.9	45	25.1	125	69.8	44	24.6	8	4.5	2	1.1
	51-60	98	78	79.6	20	20.4	71	72.4	16	16.3	2	2.0	9	9.2
	61-70	33	24	72.7	9	27.3	27	81.8	2	6.1	1	3.0	3	9.1
	71 & ABOVE	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1127	905	80.3	222	19.7	595	52.8	462	41.0	26	2.3	44	3.9
	UNDER 18	15	12	80.0	3	20.0	6	40.0	8	53.3	1	6.7	0	0.0
	18-20	109	94	86.2	15	13.8	40	36.7	61	56.0	3	2.8	5	4.6

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	49	42	85.7	7	14.3	43	87.8	4	8.2	1	2.0	1	2.0
	21-30	263	195	74.1	68	25.9	222	84.4	31	11.8	6	2.3	4	1.5
	31-40	177	134	75.7	43	24.3	139	78.5	30	16.9	4	2.3	4	2.3
	41-50	152	104	68.4	48	31.6	137	90.1	10	6.6	2	1.3	3	2.0
	51-60	104	80	76.9	24	23.1	100	96.2	2	1.9	1	1.0	1	1.0
	61-70	35	28	80.0	7	20.0	30	85.7	3	8.6	1	2.9	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	791	592	74.8	199	25.2	682	86.2	80	10.1	15	1.9	14	1.8
ORANGE	UNDER 18	119	88	73.9	31	26.1	85	71.4	25	21.0	1	0.8	8	6.7
	18-20	1364	1073	78.7	291	21.3	644	47.2	572	41.9	25	1.8	123	9.0
	21-30	7471	5968	79.9	1503	20.1	3063	41.0	3440	46.0	187	2.5	781	10.5
	31-40	3625	2997	82.7	628	17.3	1414	39.0	1729	47.7	103	2.8	379	10.5
	41-50	2533	1979	78.1	554	21.9	1363	53.8	880	34.7	91	3.6	199	7.9
	51-60	1064	834	78.4	230	21.6	680	63.9	248	23.3	32	3.0	104	9.8
	61-70	253	199	78.7	54	21.3	171	67.6	47	18.6	10	4.0	25	9.9
	71 & ABOVE	63	49	77.8	14	22.2	49	77.8	9	14.3	2	3.2	3	4.8
	TOTAL	16492	13187	80.0	3305	20.0	7469	45.3	6950	42.1	451	2.7	1622	9.8
PLACER	UNDER 18	31	24	77.4	7	22.6	31	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	204	169	82.8	35	17.2	153	75.0	33	16.2	6	2.9	12	5.9
	21-30	919	706	76.8	213	23.2	695	75.6	163	17.7	23	2.5	38	4.1
	31-40	422	335	79.4	87	20.6	303	71.8	91	21.6	13	3.1	15	3.6
	41-50	398	287	72.1	111	27.9	330	82.9	33	8.3	12	3.0	23	5.8
	51-60	212	174	82.1	38	17.9	189	89.2	17	8.0	4	1.9	2	0.9
	61-70	55	45	81.8	10	18.2	48	87.3	3	5.5	2	3.6	2	3.6
	71 & ABOVE	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	15	93.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2257	1753	77.7	504	22.3	1764	78.2	341	15.1	60	2.7	92	4.1
PLUMAS	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	19	18	94.7	1	5.3	14	73.7	3	15.8	1	5.3	1	5.3
	21-30	74	50	67.6	24	32.4	65	87.8	4	5.4	1	1.4	4	5.4
	31-40	48	29	60.4	19	39.6	42	87.5	5	10.4	0	0.0	1	2.1
	41-50	83	61	73.5	22	26.5	79	95.2	0	0.0	2	2.4	2	2.4
	51-60	41	34	82.9	7	17.1	37	90.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.8
	61-70	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	274	201	73.4	73	26.6	246	89.8	12	4.4	4	1.5	12	4.4

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	82	64	78.0	18	22.0	35	42.7	44	53.7	2	2.4	1	1.2
	18-20	975	810	83.1	165	16.9	357	36.6	540	55.4	36	3.7	42	4.3
	21-30	4248	3577	84.2	671	15.8	1317	31.0	2625	61.8	171	4.0	135	3.2
	31-40	2184	1832	83.9	352	16.1	676	31.0	1295	59.3	151	6.9	62	2.8
	41-50	1726	1384	80.2	342	19.8	761	44.1	772	44.7	131	7.6	62	3.6
	51-60	764	619	81.0	145	19.0	424	55.5	260	34.0	53	6.9	27	3.5
	61-70	217	177	81.6	40	18.4	138	63.6	56	25.8	14	6.5	9	4.1
	71 & ABOVE	56	46	82.1	10	17.9	45	80.4	3	5.4	7	12.5	1	1.8
	TOTAL	10252	8509	83.0	1743	17.0	3753	36.6	5595	54.6	565	5.5	339	3.3
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	48	39	81.3	9	18.8	29	60.4	12	25.0	5	10.4	2	4.2
	18-20	684	548	80.1	136	19.9	292	42.7	244	35.7	63	9.2	85	12.4
	21-30	3769	2890	76.7	879	23.3	1558	41.3	1308	34.7	461	12.2	442	11.7
	31-40	1642	1284	78.2	358	21.8	671	40.9	547	33.3	293	17.8	131	8.0
	41-50	1231	923	75.0	308	25.0	647	52.6	238	19.3	256	20.8	90	7.3
	51-60	508	405	79.7	103	20.3	302	59.4	66	13.0	95	18.7	45	8.9
	61-70	110	86	78.2	24	21.8	71	64.5	14	12.7	20	18.2	5	4.5
	71 & ABOVE	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	13	59.1	1	4.5	7	31.8	1	4.5
	TOTAL	8014	6194	77.3	1820	22.7	3583	44.7	2430	30.3	1200	15.0	801	10.0
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	4	50.0	4	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	47	42	89.4	5	10.6	9	19.1	35	74.5	2	4.3	1	2.1
	21-30	173	152	87.9	21	12.1	28	16.2	137	79.2	1	0.6	7	4.0
	31-40	92	77	83.7	15	16.3	29	31.5	62	67.4	0	0.0	1	1.1
	41-50	62	43	69.4	19	30.6	23	37.1	35	56.5	1	1.6	3	4.8
	51-60	32	24	75.0	8	25.0	11	34.4	18	56.3	1	3.1	2	6.3
	61-70	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	423	353	83.5	70	16.5	106	25.1	297	70.2	6	1.4	14	3.3
	UNDER 18	116	93	80.2	23	19.8	49	42.2	50	43.1	5	4.3	12	10.3
SAN BERNARDINO	18-20	1187	989	83.3	198	16.7	466	39.3	602	50.7	68	5.7	51	4.3
	21-30	5767	4855	84.2	912	15.8	1857	32.2	3236	56.1	401	7.0	273	4.7
	31-40	3091	2586	83.7	505	16.3	881	28.5	1776	57.5	292	9.4	142	4.6
	41-50	2200	1733	78.8	467	21.2	919	41.8	928	42.2	272	12.4	81	3.7
	51-60	941	783	83.2	158	16.8	480	51.0	328	34.9	100	10.6	33	3.5
	61-70	239	207	86.6	32	13.4	143	59.8	66	27.6	18	7.5	12	5.0
	71 & ABOVE	45	42	93.3	3	6.7	26	57.8	9	20.0	8	17.8	2	4.4
	TOTAL	13586	11288	83.1	2298	16.9	4821	35.5	6995	51.5	1164	8.6	606	4.5



TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)											
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE			HISPANIC			BLACK			OTHER		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	153	106	69.3	47	30.7	90	58.8	53	34.6	4	2.6	6	3.9				
	18-20	1531	1231	80.4	300	19.6	791	51.7	576	37.6	68	4.4	96	6.3				
	21-30	8048	6282	78.1	1766	21.9	3848	47.8	3073	38.2	561	7.0	566	7.0				
	31-40	3367	2639	78.4	728	21.6	1505	44.7	1425	42.3	241	7.2	196	5.8				
	41-50	2432	1833	75.4	599	24.6	1385	56.9	733	30.1	206	8.5	108	4.4				
	51-60	1025	813	79.3	212	20.7	656	64.0	246	24.0	78	7.6	45	4.4				
	61-70	243	186	76.5	57	23.5	168	69.1	46	18.9	12	4.9	17	7.0				
	71 & ABOVE	49	40	81.6	9	18.4	38	77.6	10	20.4	0	0.0	1	2.0				
	TOTAL	16848	13130	77.9	3718	22.1	8481	50.3	6162	36.6	1170	6.9	1035	6.1				
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	4	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	25.0				
	18-20	89	64	71.9	25	28.1	28	31.5	32	36.0	9	10.1	20	22.5				
	21-30	623	463	74.3	160	25.7	236	37.9	123	19.7	89	14.3	175	28.1				
	31-40	373	302	81.0	71	19.0	176	47.2	57	15.3	56	15.0	84	22.5				
	41-50	200	159	79.5	41	20.5	107	53.5	20	10.0	39	19.5	34	17.0				
	51-60	90	76	84.4	14	15.6	55	61.1	6	6.7	15	16.7	14	15.6				
	61-70	19	15	78.9	4	21.1	8	42.1	1	5.3	7	36.8	3	15.8				
	71 & ABOVE	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	3	42.9	0	0.0	3	42.9	1	14.3				
	TOTAL	1405	1087	77.4	318	22.6	615	43.8	240	17.1	218	15.5	332	23.6				
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	32	26	81.3	6	18.8	14	43.8	18	56.3	0	0.0	0	0.0				
	18-20	390	339	86.9	51	13.1	114	29.2	225	57.7	23	5.9	28	7.2				
	21-30	1737	1491	85.8	246	14.2	463	26.7	1080	62.2	96	5.5	98	5.6				
	31-40	967	810	83.8	157	16.2	270	27.9	575	59.5	78	8.1	44	4.6				
	41-50	686	543	79.2	143	20.8	280	40.8	256	37.3	112	16.3	38	5.5				
	51-60	262	211	80.5	51	19.5	139	53.1	81	30.9	33	12.6	9	3.4				
	61-70	80	63	78.8	17	21.2	42	52.5	23	28.7	11	13.8	4	5.0				
	71 & ABOVE	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	5	35.7	5	35.7	2	14.3	2	14.3				
	TOTAL	4168	3496	83.9	672	16.1	1327	31.8	2263	54.3	355	8.5	223	5.4				
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	38	25	65.8	13	34.2	31	81.6	5	13.2	0	0.0	2	5.3				
	18-20	314	247	78.7	67	21.3	223	71.0	77	24.5	5	1.6	9	2.9				
	21-30	978	803	82.1	175	17.9	576	58.9	367	37.5	14	1.4	21	2.1				
	31-40	432	348	80.6	84	19.4	254	58.8	156	36.1	12	2.8	10	2.3				
	41-50	414	281	67.9	133	32.1	320	77.3	79	19.1	5	1.2	10	2.4				
	51-60	201	154	76.6	47	23.4	171	85.1	22	10.9	2	1.0	6	3.0				
	61-70	45	31	68.9	14	31.1	39	86.7	5	11.1	0	0.0	1	2.2				
	71 & ABOVE	10	8	80.0	2	20.0	8	80.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0				
	TOTAL	2432	1897	78.0	535	22.0	1622	66.7	713	29.3	38	1.6	59	2.4				

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	29	17	58.6	12	41.4	17	58.6	10	34.5	1	3.4	1	3.4
	18-20	272	208	76.5	64	23.5	97	35.7	120	44.1	5	1.8	50	18.4
	21-30	1534	1247	81.3	287	18.7	477	31.1	670	43.7	64	4.2	323	21.1
	31-40	739	612	82.8	127	17.2	264	35.7	290	39.2	30	4.1	155	21.0
	41-50	559	438	78.4	121	21.6	294	52.6	150	26.8	44	7.9	71	12.7
	51-60	254	206	81.1	48	18.9	178	70.1	36	14.2	13	5.1	27	10.6
	61-70	45	37	82.2	8	17.8	29	64.4	6	13.3	4	8.9	6	13.3
	71 & ABOVE	15	11	73.3	4	26.7	12	80.0	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3447	2776	80.5	671	19.5	1368	39.7	1285	37.3	161	4.7	633	18.4
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	24	20	83.3	4	16.7	12	50.0	12	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	284	237	83.5	47	16.5	112	39.4	157	55.3	6	2.1	9	3.2
	21-30	1287	1039	80.7	248	19.3	543	42.2	653	50.7	32	2.5	59	4.6
	31-40	512	424	82.8	88	17.2	176	34.4	297	58.0	15	2.9	24	4.7
	41-50	401	303	75.6	98	24.4	225	56.1	156	38.9	13	3.2	7	1.7
	51-60	209	161	77.0	48	23.0	147	70.3	49	23.4	6	2.9	7	3.3
	61-70	50	40	80.0	10	20.0	34	68.0	16	32.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	13	76.5	4	23.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2784	2237	80.4	547	19.6	1262	45.3	1344	48.3	72	2.6	106	3.8
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	61	47	77.0	14	23.0	28	45.9	27	44.3	1	1.6	5	8.2
	18-20	500	397	79.4	103	20.6	162	32.4	251	50.2	15	3.0	72	14.4
	21-30	3392	2745	80.9	647	19.1	881	26.0	1869	55.1	146	4.3	496	14.6
	31-40	1467	1235	84.2	232	15.8	384	26.2	805	54.9	61	4.2	217	14.8
	41-50	979	762	77.8	217	22.2	455	46.5	366	37.4	45	4.6	113	11.5
	51-60	443	353	79.7	90	20.3	229	51.7	138	31.2	23	5.2	53	12.0
	61-70	100	72	72.0	28	28.0	70	70.0	14	14.0	5	5.0	11	11.0
	71 & ABOVE	26	23	88.5	3	11.5	17	65.4	4	15.4	1	3.8	4	15.4
	TOTAL	6968	5634	80.9	1334	19.1	2226	31.9	3474	49.9	297	4.3	971	13.9
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	27	18	66.7	9	33.3	20	74.1	6	22.2	1	3.7	0	0.0
	18-20	182	130	71.4	52	28.6	104	57.1	67	36.8	5	2.7	6	3.3
	21-30	829	634	76.5	195	23.5	441	53.2	322	38.8	20	2.4	46	5.5
	31-40	375	293	78.1	82	21.9	211	56.3	148	39.5	8	2.1	8	2.1
	41-50	318	230	72.3	88	27.7	220	69.2	79	24.8	6	1.9	13	4.1
	51-60	146	113	77.4	33	22.6	124	84.9	20	13.7	1	0.7	1	0.7
	61-70	35	26	74.3	9	25.7	29	82.9	5	14.3	0	0.0	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1970	1451	75.6	469	24.4	1157	60.3	647	33.7	41	2.1	75	3.9

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SHASTA	UNDER 18	26	18	69.2	8	30.8	23	88.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.5
	18-20	142	112	78.9	30	21.1	124	87.3	8	5.6	3	2.1	7	4.9
	21-30	663	493	74.4	170	25.6	570	86.0	51	7.7	10	1.5	32	4.8
	31-40	362	265	73.2	97	26.8	287	79.3	47	13.0	10	2.8	18	5.0
	41-50	359	241	67.1	118	32.9	333	92.8	16	4.5	2	0.6	8	2.2
	51-60	190	149	78.4	41	21.6	173	91.1	7	3.7	2	1.1	8	4.2
	61-70	45	41	91.1	4	8.9	37	82.2	4	8.9	1	2.2	3	6.7
	71 & ABOVE	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1796	1327	73.9	469	26.1	1556	86.6	133	7.4	28	1.6	79	4.4
SIERRA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	11	11	100.0	0	0.0	6	54.5	4	36.4	0	0.0	1	9.1
	31-40	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	8	72.7	3	27.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	23	16	69.6	7	30.4	22	95.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	10	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	68	56	82.4	12	17.6	59	86.8	8	11.8	0	0.0	1	1.5
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	3	0	0.0	3	100.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	44	35	79.5	9	20.5	35	79.5	4	9.1	2	4.5	3	6.8
	21-30	135	108	80.0	27	20.0	95	70.4	25	18.5	6	4.4	9	6.7
	31-40	95	80	84.2	15	15.8	64	67.4	17	17.9	5	5.3	9	9.5
	41-50	124	97	78.2	27	21.8	101	81.5	13	10.5	4	3.2	6	4.8
	51-60	57	39	68.4	18	31.6	49	86.0	2	3.5	3	5.3	3	5.3
	61-70	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	13	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	475	375	78.9	100	21.1	362	76.2	63	13.3	20	4.2	30	6.3
SOLANO	UNDER 18	37	24	64.9	13	35.1	19	51.4	12	32.4	2	5.4	4	10.8
	18-20	200	157	78.5	43	21.5	105	52.5	67	33.5	16	8.0	12	6.0
	21-30	876	716	81.7	160	18.3	358	40.9	294	33.6	137	15.6	87	9.9
	31-40	427	343	80.3	84	19.7	154	36.1	139	32.6	102	23.9	32	7.5
	41-50	384	277	72.1	107	27.9	210	54.7	68	17.7	84	21.9	22	5.7
	51-60	196	143	73.0	53	27.0	123	62.8	20	10.2	40	20.4	13	6.6
	61-70	44	38	86.4	6	13.6	28	63.6	7	15.9	6	13.6	3	6.8
	71 & ABOVE	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	3	25.0	3	25.0	5	41.7	1	8.3
	TOTAL	2176	1709	78.5	467	21.5	1000	46.0	610	28.0	392	18.0	174	8.0

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SONOMA	UNDER 18	31	24	77.4	7	22.6	16	51.6	14	45.2	0	0.0	1	3.2
	18-20	303	248	81.8	55	18.2	158	52.1	126	41.6	6	2.0	13	4.3
	21-30	1497	1213	81.0	284	19.0	720	48.1	687	45.9	32	2.1	58	3.9
	31-40	679	562	82.8	117	17.2	346	51.0	282	41.5	20	2.9	31	4.6
	41-50	532	403	75.8	129	24.2	383	72.0	112	21.1	14	2.6	23	4.3
	51-60	320	225	70.3	95	29.7	256	80.0	43	13.4	10	3.1	11	3.4
	61-70	75	60	80.0	15	20.0	68	90.7	5	6.7	0	0.0	2	2.7
	71 & ABOVE	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3455	2749	79.6	706	20.4	1963	56.8	1271	36.8	82	2.4	139	4.0
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	32	30	93.8	2	6.3	11	34.4	15	46.9	0	0.0	6	18.8
	18-20	324	262	80.9	62	19.1	103	31.8	193	59.6	11	3.4	17	5.2
	21-30	1580	1305	82.6	275	17.4	546	34.6	892	56.5	48	3.0	94	5.9
	31-40	651	565	86.8	86	13.2	224	34.4	368	56.5	37	5.7	22	3.4
	41-50	467	362	77.5	105	22.5	226	48.4	198	42.4	19	4.1	24	5.1
	51-60	198	158	79.8	40	20.2	114	57.6	56	28.3	10	5.1	18	9.1
	61-70	54	44	81.5	10	18.5	39	72.2	10	18.5	3	5.6	2	3.7
	71 & ABOVE	10	8	80.0	2	20.0	6	60.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
	TOTAL	3316	2734	82.4	582	17.6	1269	38.3	1735	52.3	128	3.9	184	5.5
SUTTER	UNDER 18	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	68	56	82.4	12	17.6	35	51.5	23	33.8	1	1.5	9	13.2
	21-30	246	209	85.0	37	15.0	96	39.0	121	49.2	14	5.7	15	6.1
	31-40	113	99	87.6	14	12.4	58	51.3	42	37.2	1	0.9	12	10.6
	41-50	92	69	75.0	23	25.0	57	62.0	26	28.3	3	3.3	6	6.5
	51-60	43	34	79.1	9	20.9	34	79.1	7	16.3	0	0.0	2	4.7
	61-70	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	6	50.0	4	33.3	0	0.0	2	16.7
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
	TOTAL	583	484	83.0	99	17.0	291	49.9	226	38.8	19	3.3	47	8.1
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	88	75	85.2	13	14.8	51	58.0	35	39.8	2	2.3	0	0.0
	21-30	338	265	78.4	73	21.6	240	71.0	90	26.6	4	1.2	4	1.2
	31-40	198	150	75.8	48	24.2	150	75.8	41	20.7	4	2.0	3	1.5
	41-50	181	130	71.8	51	28.2	155	85.6	17	9.4	3	1.7	6	3.3
	51-60	82	76	92.7	6	7.3	72	87.8	5	6.1	2	2.4	3	3.7
	61-70	33	24	72.7	9	27.3	31	93.9	2	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	935	730	78.1	205	21.9	713	76.3	191	20.4	15	1.6	16	1.7

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TRINITY	UNDER 18	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
	18-20	16	16	100.0	0	0.0	13	81.3	3	18.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	46	40	87.0	6	13.0	45	97.8	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	39	22	56.4	17	43.6	38	97.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6
	41-50	37	25	67.6	12	32.4	35	94.6	2	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	27	21	77.8	6	22.2	27	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	1	8.3
	TOTAL	180	136	75.6	44	24.4	169	93.9	8	4.4	0	0.0	3	1.7
	UNDER 18	44	39	88.6	5	11.4	14	31.8	30	68.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	420	367	87.4	53	12.6	85	20.2	322	76.7	5	1.2	8	1.9
TULARE	21-30	1840	1619	88.0	221	12.0	329	17.9	1450	78.8	23	1.2	38	2.1
	31-40	948	838	88.4	110	11.6	152	16.0	770	81.2	14	1.5	12	1.3
	41-50	560	482	86.1	78	13.9	136	24.3	404	72.1	8	1.4	12	2.1
	51-60	257	213	82.9	44	17.1	84	32.7	157	61.1	4	1.6	12	4.7
	61-70	39	37	94.9	2	5.1	18	46.2	20	51.3	1	2.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3
	TOTAL	4115	3601	87.5	514	12.5	823	20.0	3154	76.6	55	1.3	83	2.0
	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	34	26	76.5	8	23.5	32	94.1	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	2.9
	21-30	156	122	78.2	34	21.8	146	93.6	8	5.1	1	0.6	1	0.6
TUOLUMNE	31-40	104	82	78.8	22	21.2	102	98.1	2	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	122	82	67.2	40	32.8	117	95.9	2	1.6	1	0.8	2	1.6
	51-60	80	57	71.3	23	28.7	78	97.5	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	22	16	72.7	6	27.3	22	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	524	390	74.4	134	25.6	503	96.0	15	2.9	2	0.4	4	0.8
	UNDER 18	64	48	75.0	16	25.0	43	67.2	18	28.1	1	1.6	2	3.1
	18-20	475	375	78.9	100	21.1	211	44.4	232	48.8	11	2.3	21	4.4
	21-30	2414	1944	80.5	470	19.5	951	39.4	1320	54.7	60	2.5	83	3.4
	31-40	1114	896	80.4	218	19.6	433	38.9	613	55.0	33	3.0	35	3.1
VENTURA	41-50	889	675	75.9	214	24.1	502	56.5	339	38.1	30	3.4	18	2.0
	51-60	349	268	76.8	81	23.2	240	68.8	88	25.2	8	2.3	13	3.7
	61-70	81	59	72.8	22	27.2	63	77.8	14	17.3	2	2.5	2	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	24	20	83.3	4	16.7	14	58.3	9	37.5	0	0.0	1	4.2
	TOTAL	5410	4285	79.2	1125	20.8	2457	45.4	2633	48.7	145	2.7	175	3.2

TABLE B1: 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	21	17	81.0	4	19.0	13	61.9	7	33.3	0	0.0	1	4.8
	18-20	147	127	86.4	20	13.6	61	41.5	65	44.2	3	2.0	18	12.2
	21-30	557	473	84.9	84	15.1	219	39.3	271	48.7	21	3.8	46	8.3
	31-40	217	170	78.3	47	21.7	94	43.3	106	48.8	4	1.8	13	6.0
	41-50	159	124	78.0	35	22.0	86	54.1	60	37.7	7	4.4	6	3.8
	51-60	96	84	87.5	12	12.5	64	66.7	21	21.9	7	7.3	4	4.2
	61-70	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	12	66.7	5	27.8	1	5.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1221	1015	83.1	206	16.9	553	45.3	537	44.0	43	3.5	88	7.2
YUBA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	41	34	82.9	7	17.1	27	65.9	12	29.3	1	2.4	1	2.4
	21-30	285	235	82.5	50	17.5	160	56.1	92	32.3	11	3.9	22	7.7
	31-40	151	120	79.5	31	20.5	88	58.3	52	34.4	5	3.3	6	4.0
	41-50	163	119	73.0	44	27.0	124	76.1	31	19.0	4	2.5	4	2.5
	51-60	74	51	68.9	23	31.1	60	81.1	12	16.2	1	1.4	1	1.4
	61-70	27	24	88.9	3	11.1	22	81.5	5	18.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	749	591	78.9	158	21.1	483	64.5	210	28.0	22	2.9	34	4.5

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		156595	100.0	128086	81.8	28509	18.2
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	10	0.2	7	0.2	3	0.3
	18-20	328	6.2	272	6.3	56	5.4
	21-30	2318	43.5	1823	42.4	495	47.8
	31-40	1314	24.6	1091	25.4	223	21.5
	41-50	922	17.3	723	16.8	199	19.2
	51-60	345	6.5	291	6.8	54	5.2
	61-70	79	1.5	76	1.8	3	0.3
	71 & ABOVE	17	0.3	14	0.3	3	0.3
	TOTAL	5333	100.0	4297	100.0	1036	100.0
ALPINE	21-30	1	6.7	1	8.3	0	0.0
	31-40	7	46.7	6	50.0	1	33.3
	41-50	4	26.7	3	25.0	1	33.3
	51-60	2	13.3	1	8.3	1	33.3
	61-70	1	6.7	1	8.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	15	100.0	12	100.0	3	100.0
AMADOR	18-20	18	6.2	17	7.4	1	1.6
	21-30	77	26.6	64	27.9	13	21.3
	31-40	54	18.6	41	17.9	13	21.3
	41-50	82	28.3	58	25.3	24	39.3
	51-60	37	12.8	29	12.7	8	13.1
	61-70	17	5.9	16	7.0	1	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.7	4	1.7	1	1.6
	TOTAL	290	100.0	229	100.0	61	100.0
BUTTE	UNDER 18	17	1.3	14	1.4	3	1.0
	18-20	149	11.2	114	11.1	35	11.6
	21-30	549	41.4	448	43.8	101	33.4
	31-40	247	18.6	187	18.3	60	19.9
	41-50	221	16.7	153	15.0	68	22.5
	51-60	104	7.8	75	7.3	29	9.6
	61-70	29	2.2	24	2.3	5	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	9	0.7	8	0.8	1	0.3
	TOTAL	1325	100.0	1023	100.0	302	100.0
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	2	0.9	1	0.6	1	1.8
	18-20	11	4.9	8	4.8	3	5.3
	21-30	76	33.9	64	38.3	12	21.1
	31-40	40	17.9	30	18.0	10	17.5
	41-50	47	21.0	29	17.4	18	31.6
	51-60	39	17.4	27	16.2	12	21.1
	61-70	5	2.2	4	2.4	1	1.8
	71 & ABOVE	4	1.8	4	2.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	224	100.0	167	100.0	57	100.0
COLUSA	UNDER 18	8	4.0	8	4.7	0	0.0
	18-20	15	7.5	14	8.2	1	3.3
	21-30	72	35.8	63	36.8	9	30.0
	31-40	43	21.4	38	22.2	5	16.7
	41-50	34	16.9	27	15.8	7	23.3
	51-60	20	10.0	13	7.6	7	23.3
	61-70	7	3.5	6	3.5	1	3.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.0	2	1.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	201	100.0	171	100.0	30	100.0
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	23	0.7	19	0.7	4	0.6
	18-20	229	6.9	172	6.6	57	8.0
	21-30	1391	41.9	1108	42.5	283	39.7
	31-40	736	22.2	598	22.9	138	19.4
	41-50	594	17.9	433	16.6	161	22.6
	51-60	269	8.1	213	8.2	56	7.9
	61-70	66	2.0	55	2.1	11	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	12	0.4	10	0.4	2	0.3
	TOTAL	3320	100.0	2608	100.0	712	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	2	1.4	1	1.0	1	2.5
	18-20	14	9.7	9	8.7	5	12.5
	21-30	44	30.6	33	31.7	11	27.5
	31-40	24	16.7	19	18.3	5	12.5
	41-50	37	25.7	24	23.1	13	32.5
	51-60	17	11.8	12	11.5	5	12.5
	61-70	4	2.8	4	3.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.4	2	1.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	144	100.0	104	100.0	40	100.0
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	12	1.1	8	1.0	4	1.6
	18-20	87	8.1	69	8.3	18	7.4
	21-30	367	34.2	296	35.7	71	29.1
	31-40	245	22.9	196	23.7	49	20.1
	41-50	222	20.7	150	18.1	72	29.5
	51-60	117	10.9	90	10.9	27	11.1
	61-70	17	1.6	16	1.9	1	0.4
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.5	3	0.4	2	0.8
	TOTAL	1072	100.0	828	100.0	244	100.0
FRESNO	UNDER 18	24	0.4	22	0.5	2	0.2
	18-20	469	8.5	390	8.3	79	9.3
	21-30	2414	43.7	2072	44.3	342	40.5
	31-40	1285	23.2	1094	23.4	191	22.6
	41-50	879	15.9	711	15.2	168	19.9
	51-60	366	6.6	313	6.7	53	6.3
	61-70	77	1.4	69	1.5	8	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.2	11	0.2	2	0.2
	TOTAL	5527	100.0	4682	100.0	845	100.0
GLENN	18-20	33	10.2	30	10.7	3	7.0
	21-30	123	38.0	109	38.8	14	32.6
	31-40	83	25.6	73	26.0	10	23.3
	41-50	54	16.7	43	15.3	11	25.6
	51-60	23	7.1	20	7.1	3	7.0
	61-70	3	0.9	2	0.7	1	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.5	4	1.4	1	2.3
	TOTAL	324	100.0	281	100.0	43	100.0
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	2	0.3	2	0.4	0	0.0
	18-20	63	9.6	46	9.3	17	10.5
	21-30	272	41.5	200	40.5	72	44.4
	31-40	137	20.9	102	20.6	35	21.6
	41-50	110	16.8	88	17.8	22	13.6
	51-60	56	8.5	43	8.7	13	8.0
	61-70	12	1.8	9	1.8	3	1.9
	TOTAL	656	100.0	494	100.0	162	100.0
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	92	11.3	84	11.7	8	8.3
	21-30	328	40.4	286	40.0	42	43.8
	31-40	162	20.0	137	19.2	25	26.0
	41-50	129	15.9	116	16.2	13	13.5
	51-60	74	9.1	68	9.5	6	6.3
	61-70	19	2.3	17	2.4	2	2.1
	TOTAL	811	100.0	715	100.0	96	100.0



TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
INYO	UNDER 18	4	1.7	4	2.2	0	0.0
	18-20	19	8.0	9	5.1	10	16.9
	21-30	71	30.0	55	30.9	16	27.1
	31-40	40	16.9	32	18.0	8	13.6
	41-50	63	26.6	44	24.7	19	32.2
	51-60	30	12.7	26	14.6	4	6.8
	61-70	6	2.5	4	2.2	2	3.4
	71 & ABOVE	4	1.7	4	2.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	237	100.0	178	100.0	59	100.0
KERN	UNDER 18	46	1.1	40	1.1	6	0.9
	18-20	377	8.8	331	9.1	46	7.1
	21-30	1851	43.3	1585	43.8	266	41.0
	31-40	933	21.9	805	22.2	128	19.7
	41-50	739	17.3	576	15.9	163	25.1
	51-60	246	5.8	212	5.9	34	5.2
	61-70	58	1.4	53	1.5	5	0.8
	71 & ABOVE	20	0.5	19	0.5	1	0.2
	TOTAL	4270	100.0	3621	100.0	649	100.0
KINGS	UNDER 18	11	1.1	9	1.1	2	1.3
	18-20	90	9.3	78	9.6	12	7.6
	21-30	474	48.8	394	48.4	80	51.0
	31-40	207	21.3	169	20.8	38	24.2
	41-50	122	12.6	102	12.5	20	12.7
	51-60	55	5.7	50	6.1	5	3.2
	61-70	11	1.1	11	1.4	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	971	100.0	814	100.0	157	100.0
LAKE	UNDER 18	7	1.7	7	2.2	0	0.0
	18-20	23	5.5	18	5.5	5	5.4
	21-30	124	29.7	104	32.0	20	21.7
	31-40	82	19.7	61	18.8	21	22.8
	41-50	114	27.3	84	25.8	30	32.6
	51-60	46	11.0	34	10.5	12	13.0
	61-70	12	2.9	11	3.4	1	1.1
	71 & ABOVE	9	2.2	6	1.8	3	3.3
	TOTAL	417	100.0	325	100.0	92	100.0
LASSEN	UNDER 18	2	0.9	2	1.2	0	0.0
	18-20	23	10.7	14	8.1	9	21.4
	21-30	59	27.6	49	28.5	10	23.8
	31-40	42	19.6	29	16.9	13	31.0
	41-50	53	24.8	46	26.7	7	16.7
	51-60	22	10.3	19	11.0	3	7.1
	61-70	7	3.3	7	4.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	2.8	6	3.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	214	100.0	172	100.0	42	100.0
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	21	0.1	18	0.1	3	0.1
	18-20	1893	6.4	1544	6.3	349	7.0
	21-30	12613	42.8	10293	42.0	2320	46.8
	31-40	7577	25.7	6445	26.3	1132	22.8
	41-50	4891	16.6	4075	16.6	816	16.4
	51-60	1955	6.6	1682	6.9	273	5.5
	61-70	445	1.5	387	1.6	58	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	82	0.3	71	0.3	11	0.2
	TOTAL	29477	100.0	24515	100.0	4962	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
MADERA	UNDER 18	9	1.2	9	1.4	0	0.0
	18-20	57	7.9	51	7.8	6	8.3
	21-30	281	38.8	260	39.9	21	29.2
	31-40	165	22.8	151	23.2	14	19.4
	41-50	143	19.8	122	18.7	21	29.2
	51-60	55	7.6	46	7.1	9	12.5
	61-70	11	1.5	10	1.5	1	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.4	3	0.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	724	100.0	652	100.0	72	100.0
MARIN	UNDER 18	13	0.9	11	1.1	2	0.6
	18-20	114	8.3	91	8.7	23	6.9
	21-30	501	36.4	413	39.7	88	26.3
	31-40	323	23.5	246	23.6	77	23.0
	41-50	233	16.9	146	14.0	87	26.0
	51-60	145	10.5	97	9.3	48	14.3
	61-70	36	2.6	28	2.7	8	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	11	0.8	9	0.9	2	0.6
	TOTAL	1376	100.0	1041	100.0	335	100.0
MARIPOSA	18-20	6	5.9	5	6.3	1	4.3
	21-30	29	28.4	25	31.6	4	17.4
	31-40	19	18.6	13	16.5	6	26.1
	41-50	27	26.5	18	22.8	9	39.1
	51-60	18	17.6	16	20.3	2	8.7
	61-70	3	2.9	2	2.5	1	4.3
	TOTAL	102	100.0	79	100.0	23	100.0
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	6	0.6	4	0.5	2	1.0
	18-20	72	7.4	61	8.0	11	5.2
	21-30	356	36.7	277	36.4	79	37.6
	31-40	230	23.7	181	23.8	49	23.3
	41-50	187	19.3	143	18.8	44	21.0
	51-60	91	9.4	71	9.3	20	9.5
	61-70	23	2.4	18	2.4	5	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.6	6	0.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	971	100.0	761	100.0	210	100.0
MERCED	UNDER 18	9	0.6	9	0.7	0	0.0
	18-20	142	9.6	118	9.4	24	10.8
	21-30	639	43.4	565	45.2	74	33.3
	31-40	334	22.7	275	22.0	59	26.6
	41-50	218	14.8	170	13.6	48	21.6
	51-60	101	6.9	86	6.9	15	6.8
	61-70	26	1.8	24	1.9	2	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.3	4	0.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1473	100.0	1251	100.0	222	100.0
MODOC	18-20	6	7.9	6	10.5	0	0.0
	21-30	16	21.1	12	21.1	4	21.1
	31-40	23	30.3	15	26.3	8	42.1
	41-50	16	21.1	13	22.8	3	15.8
	51-60	10	13.2	7	12.3	3	15.8
	61-70	3	3.9	2	3.5	1	5.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	2.6	2	3.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	76	100.0	57	100.0	19	100.0
MONO	UNDER 18	1	0.8	1	0.9	0	0.0
	18-20	5	3.8	4	3.5	1	5.9
	21-30	47	36.2	44	38.9	3	17.6
	31-40	35	26.9	30	26.5	5	29.4
	41-50	23	17.7	17	15.0	6	35.3
	51-60	11	8.5	9	8.0	2	11.8
	61-70	7	5.4	7	6.2	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.8	1	0.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	130	100.0	113	100.0	17	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	11	0.4	9	0.4	2	0.6
	18-20	211	8.6	188	8.8	23	7.3
	21-30	1119	45.4	1015	47.3	104	32.9
	31-40	561	22.8	493	23.0	68	21.5
	41-50	331	13.4	262	12.2	69	21.8
	51-60	179	7.3	140	6.5	39	12.3
	61-70	39	1.6	30	1.4	9	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.5	11	0.5	2	0.6
	TOTAL	2464	100.0	2148	100.0	316	100.0
NAPA	18-20	91	9.8	80	10.1	11	8.3
	21-30	385	41.5	339	42.6	46	34.8
	31-40	208	22.4	184	23.1	24	18.2
	41-50	142	15.3	113	14.2	29	22.0
	51-60	75	8.1	60	7.5	15	11.4
	61-70	22	2.4	16	2.0	6	4.5
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.5	4	0.5	1	0.8
	TOTAL	928	100.0	796	100.0	132	100.0
NEVADA	UNDER 18	4	0.7	2	0.4	2	1.5
	18-20	46	7.7	34	7.3	12	9.0
	21-30	206	34.3	166	35.6	40	29.9
	31-40	112	18.7	81	17.4	31	23.1
	41-50	140	23.3	103	22.1	37	27.6
	51-60	70	11.7	63	13.5	7	5.2
	61-70	20	3.3	16	3.4	4	3.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.3	1	0.2	1	0.7
	TOTAL	600	100.0	466	100.0	134	100.0
ORANGE	UNDER 18	42	0.3	35	0.3	7	0.3
	18-20	1080	7.5	854	7.3	226	8.3
	21-30	6441	44.9	5258	45.2	1183	43.4
	31-40	3357	23.4	2786	23.9	571	21.0
	41-50	2263	15.8	1743	15.0	520	19.1
	51-60	900	6.3	749	6.4	151	5.5
	61-70	227	1.6	172	1.5	55	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	47	0.3	37	0.3	10	0.4
	TOTAL	14357	100.0	11634	100.0	2723	100.0
PLACER	UNDER 18	24	1.0	20	1.1	4	0.7
	18-20	171	7.3	127	7.1	44	8.1
	21-30	957	41.0	753	42.0	204	37.6
	31-40	501	21.5	388	21.7	113	20.8
	41-50	421	18.0	307	17.1	114	21.0
	51-60	207	8.9	157	8.8	50	9.2
	61-70	41	1.8	33	1.8	8	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	11	0.5	6	0.3	5	0.9
	TOTAL	2333	100.0	1791	100.0	542	100.0
PLUMAS	18-20	15	7.1	11	6.6	4	8.9
	21-30	51	24.1	40	24.0	11	24.4
	31-40	58	27.4	50	29.9	8	17.8
	41-50	45	21.2	33	19.8	12	26.7
	51-60	34	16.0	25	15.0	9	20.0
	61-70	8	3.8	8	4.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	2.2
	TOTAL	212	100.0	167	100.0	45	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	39	0.5	33	0.5	6	0.4
	18-20	790	9.9	653	10.0	137	9.4
	21-30	3301	41.2	2716	41.4	585	40.3
	31-40	1760	22.0	1500	22.9	260	17.9
	41-50	1339	16.7	1010	15.4	329	22.7
	51-60	571	7.1	465	7.1	106	7.3
	61-70	165	2.1	140	2.1	25	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	43	0.5	39	0.6	4	0.3
	TOTAL	8008	100.0	6556	100.0	1452	100.0
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	41	0.7	40	0.9	1	0.1
	18-20	540	9.0	438	9.4	102	7.5
	21-30	2664	44.3	2066	44.3	598	44.2
	31-40	1300	21.6	1011	21.7	289	21.4
	41-50	1001	16.6	743	15.9	258	19.1
	51-60	371	6.2	287	6.1	84	6.2
	61-70	85	1.4	68	1.5	17	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	17	0.3	14	0.3	3	0.2
	TOTAL	6019	100.0	4667	100.0	1352	100.0
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	37	10.6	34	11.2	3	6.5
	21-30	138	39.5	119	39.3	19	41.3
	31-40	73	20.9	66	21.8	7	15.2
	41-50	69	19.8	55	18.2	14	30.4
	51-60	21	6.0	18	5.9	3	6.5
	61-70	9	2.6	9	3.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	349	100.0	303	100.0	46	100.0
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	41	0.4	35	0.5	6	0.4
	18-20	771	8.2	638	8.3	133	8.0
	21-30	3981	42.5	3297	42.8	684	41.1
	31-40	2129	22.7	1752	22.7	377	22.6
	41-50	1601	17.1	1283	16.6	318	19.1
	51-60	680	7.3	550	7.1	130	7.8
	61-70	132	1.4	119	1.5	13	0.8
	71 & ABOVE	37	0.4	33	0.4	4	0.2
	TOTAL	9372	100.0	7707	100.0	1665	100.0
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	81	0.5	63	0.5	18	0.6
	18-20	1305	8.5	1038	8.5	267	8.9
	21-30	7188	47.1	5792	47.2	1396	46.5
	31-40	3262	21.4	2676	21.8	586	19.5
	41-50	2223	14.6	1709	13.9	514	17.1
	51-60	939	6.1	765	6.2	174	5.8
	61-70	223	1.5	186	1.5	37	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	52	0.3	40	0.3	12	0.4
	TOTAL	15273	100.0	12269	100.0	3004	100.0
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	2	0.2	2	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	42	4.5	34	4.6	8	4.2
	21-30	409	43.9	311	41.9	98	51.6
	31-40	252	27.0	208	28.0	44	23.2
	41-50	135	14.5	115	15.5	20	10.5
	51-60	69	7.4	53	7.1	16	8.4
	61-70	20	2.1	16	2.2	4	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.3	3	0.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	932	100.0	742	100.0	190	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	17	0.5	17	0.6	0	0.0
	18-20	314	9.2	266	9.1	48	9.7
	21-30	1455	42.6	1277	43.7	178	35.8
	31-40	765	22.4	646	22.1	119	23.9
	41-50	538	15.7	441	15.1	97	19.5
	51-60	246	7.2	199	6.8	47	9.5
	61-70	68	2.0	63	2.2	5	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	14	0.4	11	0.4	3	0.6
	TOTAL	3417	100.0	2920	100.0	497	100.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	13	0.6	11	0.7	2	0.5
	18-20	262	12.6	206	12.5	56	12.8
	21-30	875	42.0	716	43.5	159	36.5
	31-40	352	16.9	291	17.7	61	14.0
	41-50	362	17.4	264	16.0	98	22.5
	51-60	172	8.3	122	7.4	50	11.5
	61-70	39	1.9	32	1.9	7	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.3	4	0.2	3	0.7
	TOTAL	2082	100.0	1646	100.0	436	100.0
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	12	0.4	11	0.5	1	0.2
	18-20	196	7.1	160	7.1	36	7.0
	21-30	1211	43.6	990	43.8	221	42.8
	31-40	596	21.5	487	21.5	109	21.1
	41-50	459	16.5	351	15.5	108	20.9
	51-60	235	8.5	206	9.1	29	5.6
	61-70	52	1.9	42	1.9	10	1.9
	71 & ABOVE	16	0.6	14	0.6	2	0.4
	TOTAL	2777	100.0	2261	100.0	516	100.0
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	12	0.5	11	0.6	1	0.2
	18-20	291	11.9	230	11.6	61	13.0
	21-30	999	40.8	820	41.4	179	38.0
	31-40	489	20.0	402	20.3	87	18.5
	41-50	426	17.4	328	16.6	98	20.8
	51-60	180	7.3	146	7.4	34	7.2
	61-70	43	1.8	35	1.8	8	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	11	0.4	8	0.4	3	0.6
	TOTAL	2451	100.0	1980	100.0	471	100.0
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	52	0.9	40	0.8	12	1.2
	18-20	438	7.5	364	7.5	74	7.7
	21-30	2737	46.8	2274	46.6	463	47.9
	31-40	1301	22.3	1127	23.1	174	18.0
	41-50	880	15.1	719	14.7	161	16.6
	51-60	344	5.9	275	5.6	69	7.1
	61-70	83	1.4	69	1.4	14	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	10	0.2	10	0.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	5845	100.0	4878	100.0	967	100.0
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	17	1.2	13	1.2	4	1.2
	18-20	154	10.8	119	11.0	35	10.2
	21-30	595	41.6	460	42.4	135	39.2
	31-40	271	19.0	218	20.1	53	15.4
	41-50	235	16.4	153	14.1	82	23.8
	51-60	124	8.7	97	8.9	27	7.8
	61-70	25	1.7	20	1.8	5	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.6	5	0.5	3	0.9
	TOTAL	1429	100.0	1085	100.0	344	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SHASTA	UNDER 18	14	1.1	13	1.3	1	0.4
	18-20	121	9.8	91	9.4	30	11.0
	21-30	404	32.7	329	34.1	75	27.6
	31-40	260	21.0	194	20.1	66	24.3
	41-50	280	22.7	209	21.7	71	26.1
	51-60	115	9.3	94	9.8	21	7.7
	61-70	31	2.5	24	2.5	7	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	11	0.9	10	1.0	1	0.4
	TOTAL	1236	100.0	964	100.0	272	100.0
SIERRA	21-30	5	19.2	4	20.0	1	16.7
	31-40	6	23.1	4	20.0	2	33.3
	41-50	9	34.6	7	35.0	2	33.3
	51-60	5	19.2	4	20.0	1	16.7
	71 & ABOVE	1	3.8	1	5.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	26	100.0	20	100.0	6	100.0
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	7	1.9	4	1.4	3	4.2
	18-20	18	5.0	17	5.9	1	1.4
	21-30	102	28.4	81	28.2	21	29.2
	31-40	85	23.7	67	23.3	18	25.0
	41-50	94	26.2	72	25.1	22	30.6
	51-60	37	10.3	32	11.1	5	6.9
	61-70	14	3.9	12	4.2	2	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.6	2	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	359	100.0	287	100.0	72	100.0
SOLANO	UNDER 18	21	1.3	20	1.4	1	0.3
	18-20	154	9.2	125	9.0	29	10.0
	21-30	656	39.2	555	40.1	101	34.9
	31-40	342	20.4	283	20.4	59	20.4
	41-50	305	18.2	241	17.4	64	22.1
	51-60	157	9.4	127	9.2	30	10.4
	61-70	31	1.9	26	1.9	5	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.5	8	0.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1674	100.0	1385	100.0	289	100.0
SONOMA	UNDER 18	39	1.5	31	1.4	8	1.7
	18-20	243	9.3	187	8.7	56	11.6
	21-30	1128	43.0	957	44.7	171	35.6
	31-40	555	21.2	463	21.6	92	19.1
	41-50	403	15.4	302	14.1	101	21.0
	51-60	202	7.7	160	7.5	42	8.7
	61-70	38	1.4	30	1.4	8	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	14	0.5	11	0.5	3	0.6
	TOTAL	2622	100.0	2141	100.0	481	100.0
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	31	1.5	25	1.4	6	1.5
	18-20	212	9.9	173	9.9	39	9.9
	21-30	944	44.3	778	44.7	166	42.3
	31-40	434	20.4	352	20.2	82	20.9
	41-50	339	15.9	269	15.5	70	17.9
	51-60	126	5.9	105	6.0	21	5.4
	61-70	38	1.8	33	1.9	5	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.4	5	0.3	3	0.8
	TOTAL	2132	100.0	1740	100.0	392	100.0
SUTTER	UNDER 18	3	0.7	2	0.5	1	1.4
	18-20	52	11.7	44	11.8	8	11.1
	21-30	173	38.8	150	40.1	23	31.9
	31-40	95	21.3	81	21.7	14	19.4
	41-50	80	17.9	58	15.5	22	30.6
	51-60	34	7.6	31	8.3	3	4.2
	61-70	8	1.8	7	1.9	1	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	446	100.0	374	100.0	72	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	5	1.3	5	1.6	0	0.0
	18-20	21	5.3	17	5.6	4	4.3
	21-30	134	33.7	114	37.3	20	21.7
	31-40	78	19.6	54	17.6	24	26.1
	41-50	89	22.4	58	19.0	31	33.7
	51-60	59	14.8	50	16.3	9	9.8
	61-70	10	2.5	6	2.0	4	4.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	2	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	398	100.0	306	100.0	92	100.0
TRINITY	18-20	1	1.2	1	1.4	0	0.0
	21-30	33	38.4	28	38.9	5	35.7
	31-40	19	22.1	14	19.4	5	35.7
	41-50	23	26.7	20	27.8	3	21.4
	51-60	7	8.1	7	9.7	0	0.0
	61-70	1	1.2	0	0.0	1	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	2	2.3	2	2.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	86	100.0	72	100.0	14	100.0
TULARE	UNDER 18	19	0.7	18	0.7	1	0.3
	18-20	318	11.8	276	11.5	42	14.2
	21-30	1133	41.9	1021	42.4	112	37.8
	31-40	619	22.9	553	23.0	66	22.3
	41-50	410	15.2	358	14.9	52	17.6
	51-60	166	6.1	147	6.1	19	6.4
	61-70	34	1.3	31	1.3	3	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.2	4	0.2	1	0.3
	TOTAL	2704	100.0	2408	100.0	296	100.0
TUOLUMNE	UNDER 18	4	1.0	4	1.3	0	0.0
	18-20	29	7.2	24	8.0	5	4.9
	21-30	102	25.4	85	28.3	17	16.7
	31-40	79	19.7	58	19.3	21	20.6
	41-50	113	28.1	74	24.7	39	38.2
	51-60	55	13.7	37	12.3	18	17.6
	61-70	18	4.5	16	5.3	2	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	2	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	402	100.0	300	100.0	102	100.0
VENTURA	UNDER 18	18	0.4	16	0.4	2	0.2
	18-20	412	9.2	336	9.2	76	9.1
	21-30	2081	46.4	1708	46.8	373	44.6
	31-40	968	21.6	795	21.8	173	20.7
	41-50	685	15.3	535	14.6	150	17.9
	51-60	258	5.7	207	5.7	51	6.1
	61-70	60	1.3	50	1.4	10	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.2	5	0.1	2	0.2
	TOTAL	4489	100.0	3652	100.0	837	100.0
YOLO	UNDER 18	9	0.9	9	1.0	0	0.0
	18-20	126	12.1	110	12.6	16	9.8
	21-30	489	47.1	421	48.2	68	41.5
	31-40	174	16.8	141	16.1	33	20.1
	41-50	149	14.4	117	13.4	32	19.5
	51-60	71	6.8	60	6.9	11	6.7
	61-70	16	1.5	14	1.6	2	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.4	2	0.2	2	1.2
	TOTAL	1038	100.0	874	100.0	164	100.0

TABLE B2: 2006 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
YUBA	UNDER 18	2	0.4	1	0.3	1	1.0
	18-20	27	5.9	26	7.3	1	1.0
	21-30	181	39.8	150	42.0	31	31.6
	31-40	97	21.3	67	18.8	30	30.6
	41-50	101	22.2	70	19.6	31	31.6
	51-60	36	7.9	34	9.5	2	2.0
	61-70	7	1.5	5	1.4	2	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.9	4	1.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	455	100.0	357	100.0	98	100.0



TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	79.4%		152059	4536	15563	2985	3497	1297	77.0	11.0
ALAMEDA	73.5%	OAKLAND	83	21	1	0	5	0	137.0	51.0
		JUV OAKLAND	12	0	1	1	0	0	178.0	44.0
		ALAMEDA	163	1	18	4	3	7	53.0	0.0
		BERKELEY	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.0	0.0
		FREMONT	711	12	85	10	4	10	133.0	15.0
		PLEASANTON	1176	4	265	19	32	15	99.0	6.0
		OAKLAND	1668	8	175	54	25	12	74.0	4.0
		HAYWARD	1472	2	239	29	88	22	128.0	7.0
		TOTAL	5285	48	784	117	161	66	105.0	6.0
		ALPINE	13	2	5	1	0	0	57.0	8.0
AMADOR	82.4%	TOTAL	13	2	5	1	0	0	57.0	8.0
		JUV AMADOR	2	0	0	0	0	0	105.0	11.0
		JACKSON	279	9	45	13	2	2	72.0	3.0
		TOTAL	281	9	45	13	2	2	72.0	4.0
BUTTE	80.4%	BUTTE	1221	48	251	85	16	0	73.0	20.0
		JUV BUTTE	20	1	0	1	0	1	111.0	9.0
		CHICO	15	0	3	1	5	13	38.0	296.0
		GRIDLEY	4	0	0	0	0	1	40.0	446.0
		OROVILLE	13	1	1	1	3	5	114.0	18.0
		PARADISE	2	0	1	0	0	3	69.0	425.0
		TOTAL	1275	50	256	88	24	23	73.0	20.0
		CALAVERAS	214	9	57	8	6	6	55.0	20.0
		JUV SAN ANDREAS	1	0	1	0	0	0	81.0	37.0
		TOTAL	215	9	58	8	6	6	55.0	20.0
COLUSA	75.0%	COLUSA	2	4	0	0	0	0	106.0	9.0
		JUV COLUSA	10	0	0	0	0	0	39.0	72.0
		COLUSA OAK	180	5	30	11	4	5	61.0	8.0
		TOTAL	192	9	30	11	4	5	62.0	9.0
CONTRA COSTA	82.9%	CONTRA COSTA	29	43	0	0	3	0	226.0	68.0
		MARTINEZ EST DV	40	0	6	0	1	0	133.0	51.0
		CONCORD	436	5	36	0	10	14	105.0	13.0
		RICHMOND	641	24	92	2	15	12	121.0	12.0
		PITTSBURG	832	12	94	1	8	13	179.0	12.0
		WALNUT CREEK	1247	11	212	1	10	14	155.0	8.0
		TOTAL	3225	95	440	4	47	53	146.0	9.0
		DEL NORTE	139	5	58	2	15	4	70.0	22.0
		TOTAL	139	5	58	2	15	4	70.0	22.0
		SO LAKE TAHOE	421	8	108	11	1	6	76.0	15.0
EI DORADO	76.0%	PLACERVILLE	605	38	77	21	8	11	100.0	7.0
		TOTAL	1026	46	185	32	9	17	90.0	11.0

\*Adjudication time is presented using median values (in days) for 2006 data.

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
FRESNO	70.6%	FRESNO	1	0	0	0	0	37	14.0	73.0
		JUV FRESNO	32	2	0	0	0	0	138.0	67.0
		FRESNO CENTRAL	3915	209	502	56	51	0	104.0	49.0
		CLOVIS	435	0	59	3	3	0	121.0	50.0
		COALINGA	162	3	17	5	4	1	135.0	31.0
		FIREBAUGH	150	2	13	0	2	1	92.0	10.0
		FOWLER	42	0	8	1	1	2	96.0	9.0
		KERMAN	55	5	3	1	0	0	94.0	27.0
		KINGSBURG	238	15	30	3	0	1	94.0	69.0
		REEDLEY	232	7	20	2	1	1	114.0	38.0
		SELMA	21	0	1	0	1	0	108.0	12.0
		US CT FRESNO	1	0	0	0	0	0	103.0	496.0
		TOTAL	5284	243	653	71	63	43	107.0	45.0
GLENN	63.3%	GLENN	318	6	56	8	15	5	53.0	10.0
		TOTAL	318	6	56	8	15	5	53.0	10.0
HUMBOLDT	56.4%	EUREKA	628	28	204	39	29	1	87.0	14.0
		TOTAL	628	28	204	39	29	1	87.0	14.0
IMPERIAL	59.2%	IMPERIAL	282	6	6	36	3	0	187.0	142.0
		BRAWLEY	74	1	9	2	1	23	134.0	79.0
		CALEXICO	143	0	0	17	1	0	143.0	93.0
		EL CENTRO	299	6	15	19	4	0	120.0	30.0
		TOTAL	798	13	30	74	10	23	141.0	79.0
INYO	71.0%	INYO	4	6	1	0	1	0	59.0	29.0
		JUV INYO	1	1	0	0	0	0	55.0	186.0
		BISHOP	218	5	50	1	4	1	60.0	5.0
		TOTAL	225	12	51	1	5	1	60.0	5.0
KERN	81.6%	KERN	1	1	0	0	0	25	42.0	528.0
		JUV KERN	58	3	0	2	0	0	73.0	15.0
		LAMONT	370	16	59	12	14	1	25.0	1.0
		BAKERSFIELD	2568	56	260	36	21	10	31.0	35.0
		DELANO	191	13	10	3	1	2	30.0	5.0
		LAKE ISABELLA	88	3	7	3	2	1	45.0	0.0
		TAFT	151	6	16	1	2	7	27.0	4.0
		SHAFTER	182	2	22	4	9	6	25.0	2.0
		MOJAVE	370	7	41	30	14	4	39.0	0.0
		RIDGECREST	178	6	21	15	2	3	45.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4157	113	436	106	65	59	34.0	21.0
KINGS	74.9%	JUV KINGS	14	0	0	0	0	0	117.0	4.0
		HANFORD	793	34	95	35	8	7	80.0	0.0
		AVENAL	59	1	1	0	1	0	96.0	0.0
		CORCORAN	66	1	5	3	2	0	86.0	0.0
		LEMOORE	3	0	0	0	0	0	32.0	7.0
		TOTAL	935	36	101	38	11	7	82.0	0.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
LAKE	77.9%	LAKE	241	9	17	3	6	4	126.0	29.0
		CLEARLAKE	158	9	28	11	3	8	146.0	32.0
		TOTAL	399	18	45	14	9	12	135.0	30.0
LASSEN	81.7%	JUV LASSEN	2	0	0	0	0	0	61.0	64.0
		SUSANVILLE	209	3	9	11	7	4	121.0	38.0
		TOTAL	211	3	9	11	7	4	119.0	38.0
LOS ANGELES	74.6%	LOS ANGELES	126	53	0	0	1	0	106.0	13.0
		POMONA	92	15	0	0	2	0	60.0	10.0
		LANCASTER	42	16	0	0	0	0	89.0	10.0
		SAN FERNANDO	87	32	0	0	1	0	116.0	9.0
		VAN NUYS	25	15	0	0	1	0	159.0	10.0
		LONG BEACH	32	21	1	0	1	0	140.0	12.0
		COMPTON	10	10	0	0	0	0	182.0	11.0
		NORWALK	57	27	0	0	0	0	102.0	9.0
		TORRANCE	18	6	0	0	0	0	257.0	10.0
		SANTA MONICA	14	14	1	0	0	0	283.0	10.0
		JUV LOS ANGELES	2	0	0	0	0	0	219.0	71.0
		LOS ANGELES DLQ	15	4	1	0	1	0	129.0	8.0
		LANGELES AIRPRT	1364	12	205	41	89	0	83.0	13.0
		ALHAMBRA	638	6	57	8	13	0	97.0	10.0
		LANCASTER	1188	11	86	14	13	6	64.0	10.0
		BEVERLY HILLS	328	3	53	7	11	9	111.0	10.0
		BURBANK	332	7	23	3	4	0	46.0	15.0
		WEST COVINA	1965	9	48	4	43	1	67.0	12.0
		CHATSWORTH	6	0	0	0	1	0	118.0	0.0
		COMPTON	1074	15	28	2	14	15	89.0	15.0
		DOWNEY	1151	10	25	5	21	2	73.0	10.0
		EAST LOS ANGELES	1221	3	102	25	30	47	82.0	13.0
		ELMONTE	737	9	20	5	20	6	74.0	13.0
		GLENDALE	526	8	59	15	9	4	96.0	15.0
		INGLEWOOD	277	6	18	4	5	10	120.0	13.0
		LONG BEACH	1453	12	224	73	41	1	77.0	24.0
		LA METRO	5595	18	599	16	793	3	42.0	18.0
		BELLFLOWER	627	13	46	3	12	1	84.0	13.0
		SANTA CLARITA	909	12	135	32	22	7	91.0	11.0
		PASADENA	823	12	238	73	52	2	102.0	10.0
		MALIBU	296	4	83	13	17	0	118.0	10.0
		POMONA	1269	13	50	4	29	16	64.0	13.0
		HUNTINGTON PK	2	0	0	0	0	4	74.0	12.0
		SANTA MONICA	1	0	0	0	1	0	139.0	0.0
		TORRANCE	1456	16	356	44	14	1	94.0	11.0
		WHITTIER	621	17	21	9	8	7	83.0	14.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
LOS ANGELES (cont.)		HOLLYWOOD	162	0	11	3	7	2	42.0	11.0
		SAN FERNANDO	1584	22	162	27	47	0	30.0	14.0
		SAN PEDRO	1	0	0	0	0	0	68.0	0.0
		VAN NUYS	2769	33	294	9	248	1	44.0	11.0
		L ANGELES PURD	1	0	0	0	1	0	130.0	0.0
		AVALON	4	0	0	0	0	0	38.0	15.0
		US DIST CTLA	66	0	0	0	0	0	107.0	21.0
		TOTAL	28989	488	2946	439	1573	145	67.0	13.0
		MADERA	35	28	2	2	2	5	148.0	23.0
		JUV MADERA	10	0	0	0	0	0	65.0	56.0
MADERA	65.6%	CHOWCHILLA	496	1	78	3	6	2	206.0	15.0
		MADERA CRIM	30	0	0	0	0	0	150.0	21.0
		BASS LAKE SIERRA	119	5	10	9	2	4	153.0	32.0
		TOTAL	690	34	90	14	10	11	188.0	19.0
		MARIN	1353	23	0	3	37	8	59.0	23.0
		TOTAL	1353	23	0	3	37	8	59.0	23.0
		MARIPOSA JUD	98	4	34	9	4	5	59.0	11.0
		TOTAL	98	4	34	9	4	5	59.0	11.0
		MENDOCINO	7	12	1	0	1	0	72.0	98.0
		JUV MENDOCINO	10	0	2	0	0	0	112.0	36.0
MENDOCINO	89.3%	WILLITS	136	9	35	2	3	0	45.0	60.0
		UKIAH	647	3	210	12	6	25	34.0	80.0
		POINT ARENA	4	0	2	3	0	0	81.0	113.0
		COVELO	23	0	0	2	0	0	42.0	55.0
		FORT BRAGG	112	8	23	2	1	0	63.0	58.0
		TOTAL	939	32	273	21	11	25	41.0	70.0
		MERCED PROB	17	0	0	0	1	0	154.0	19.0
		MERCED	1092	21	129	14	14	26	109.0	77.0
		LOS BANOS	337	6	27	9	10	10	79.0	120.0
		TOTAL	1446	27	156	23	25	36	102.0	88.0
MODOC	77.6%	ALTURAS	75	1	5	4	3	3	65.0	21.0
		TOTAL	75	1	5	4	3	3	65.0	21.0
MONO	87.2%	MONO	1	0	0	0	0	0	118.0	114.0
		BRIDGEPORT	29	0	1	1	0	0	52.0	20.0
		MAMMOTH LAKES	97	3	8	2	1	2	78.0	14.0
		TOTAL	127	3	9	3	1	2	72.0	14.0
		MONTEREY	109	37	4	1	2	0	97.0	20.0
MONTEREY	80.7%	JUV MONTEREY	14	1	0	1	0	0	137.0	15.0
		MARINA	21	0	0	0	10	1	74.0	34.0
		SALINAS	1942	8	203	98	18	14	43.0	12.0
		KING CITY	325	7	24	5	2	3	61.0	29.0
		TOTAL	2411	53	231	105	32	18	50.0	14.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
NAPA	87.9%		891	37	107	3	5	6	56.0	2.0
		TOTAL	891	37	107	3	5	6	56.0	2.0
NEVADA	79.2%		6	12	0	0	0	0	144.0	28.0
		JUV NEVADA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.0	0.0
		JUV TRUCKEE	4	0	0	0	0	0	73.0	11.0
		NEVADA CITY	359	3	89	16	9	7	54.0	56.0
		TRUCKEE	213	3	70	5	2	7	52.0	7.0
		TOTAL	582	18	159	22	11	14	54.0	46.0
ORANGE	89.7%		77	3	2	0	0	0	151.0	7.0
		JUV ORANGE	3334	102	153	15	42	12	87.0	1.0
		FULLERTON	3602	101	224	20	38	23	108.0	0.0
		WESTMINSTER	1057	32	91	6	11	1	88.0	0.0
		LAGUNA HILLS	1	0	0	0	0	9	64.0	388.0
		LAGUNA NIGUEL	3549	104	249	26	20	5	113.0	0.0
		NEWPORT BEACH	2291	104	59	15	20	8	109.0	2.0
		SANTA ANA	13911	446	778	82	131	58	104.0	0.0
		TOTAL	34	2	3	1	1	0	128.0	1.0
PLACER	99.2%		1	0	0	0	0	0	152.0	32.0
		JUV TAHOE VISTA	2009	73	126	11	6	13	66.0	17.0
		AUBURN	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.0	0.0
		ROSEVILLE	213	1	40	1	0	1	65.0	3.0
		TAHOE CITY	2257	76	169	13	9	14	66.0	14.0
		TOTAL	208	4	52	11	1	0	51.0	22.0
PLUMAS	80.9%		208	4	52	11	1	0	51.0	22.0
		TOTAL	3344	164	4	1	2	16	73.0	1.0
RIVERSIDE	80.9%		71	24	0	1	0	3	98.0	4.0
		JUV RIVERSIDE	11	0	0	0	0	0	122.0	10.0
		JUV INDIO	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	0.0
		HEMET	9	1	0	43	23	3	96.0	47.0
		BANNING	448	4	3	16	6	1	90.0	4.0
		INDIO	1481	16	93	178	29	3	78.0	2.0
		BLTYHE	120	1	22	11	3	5	60.0	1.0
		MURRIETA	2279	22	15	46	8	6	73.0	1.0
		TEMECULA	5	0	0	0	5	1	57.0	2.0
		TOTAL	7775	233	137	296	76	39	75.0	1.0
SACRAMENTO	77.0%		150	181	3	0	2	0	117.0	23.0
		JUV SACRAMENTO	58	0	0	1	0	0	72.0	37.0
		SACRAMENTO CM	5544	81	664	20	82	16	54.0	14.0
		US DIST COURT	5	0	2	0	0	0	123.0	82.0
		TOTAL	5757	262	669	21	84	16	50.0	15.0
SAN BENITO	88.1%		332	15	39	7	5	3	114.0	20.0
		JUV SAN BENITO	2	0	0	0	0	0	89.0	19.0
		TOTAL	334	15	39	7	5	3	58.0	14.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN BERNARDINO	76.6%	SAN BERNARDINO	35	72	0	10	8	53	79.0	51.0
		R CUCAMONGA	29	32	0	0	0	0	147.0	38.0
		VICTORVILLE	49	30	0	0	1	0	124.0	41.0
		BARSTOW	420	21	61	22	22	17	90.0	8.0
		JOSHUA TREE	5	12	0	0	0	1	39.0	36.0
		JUV SN BRNDNO	20	1	2	0	0	0	122.0	13.0
		JUV TR CUCMNGA	1	0	0	0	0	0	130.0	12.0
		JUV R CUCMNGA	16	1	0	1	2	0	90.0	12.0
		JUV VICTORVILLE	14	1	0	1	1	0	106.0	6.0
		CHINO	407	24	3	7	9	6	85.0	4.0
		REDLANDS	213	0	1	0	4	5	51.0	3.0
		SN BRNDND IV	2448	49	56	83	141	4	100.0	5.0
		FONTANA	996	53	35	24	48	3	125.0	5.0
		VICTORVILLE	1305	16	34	23	37	23	117.0	4.0
		RN CHCUMGA DIST	2510	25	14	53	32	7	93.0	3.0
		BIG BEAR LAKE	174	8	20	13	5	0	69.0	8.0
		TWIN PEAKS	30	0	0	3	0	2	59.0	5.0
		SUP NEEDLES	101	16	46	9	11	5	101.0	9.0
		JOSHUA TREE DIST	234	4	41	26	11	0	88.0	9.0
		TOTAL	9007	365	313	275	332	126	114.0	20.0
SAN DIEGO	84.4%	SAN DIEGO	150	129	9	0	0	31	138.0	14.0
		VISTA	69	137	6	0	1	15	76.0	30.0
		JUV SAN DIEGO	96	3	0	1	4	0	126.0	5.0
		EL CAJON	2399	73	275	47	19	15	67.0	12.0
		VISTA	4644	66	666	159	38	1	52.0	13.0
		VISTA 2	22	0	0	0	2	2	62.0	35.0
		SN DIEGO KRNYBR	5534	6	434	63	49	14	110.0	8.0
		CHULA VISTA	1891	54	156	32	22	9	100.0	34.0
		TOTAL	14805	468	1546	302	135	87	100.0	4.0
		SAN FRANCISCO	5	4	1	0	1	0	227.0	7.0
		JUV SANFRAN	2	0	0	0	0	0	162.0	0.0
SAN FRANCISCO	69.8%	JUV DEL S FRAN	1	0	0	0	0	0	104.0	7.0
		TRAF SANFRAN	903	17	138	137	11	58	107.0	5.0
		TOTAL	911	21	139	137	12	58	79.0	13.0
		JUV SAN JOAQUIN	24	1	1	5	2	0	161.0	77.0
		LODI	549	34	70	4	11	4	39.0	7.0
SAN JOAQUIN	77.0%	MANTECA	510	19	57	21	5	3	57.0	6.0
		TRACY	310	7	38	9	4	4	49.0	6.0
		STOCKTON	1898	64	223	17	24	10	39.0	8.0
		TOTAL	3292	125	389	56	46	21	108.0	5.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN LUIS OBISPO	81.7%	SAN LUIS OBISPO	0	1	0	0	0	0	35.0	2.0
		JUV S L OBISPO	1	0	0	0	0	0	475.0	17.0
		S L OBISPO MONT	2005	74	392	48	77	18	43.0	27.0
		GROVER BEACH	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0	0.0
		PASO ROBLES	1	0	0	0	0	2	19.0	80.0
		TOTAL	2007	75	392	48	77	21	45.0	7.0
SAN MATEO	78.4%	SAN MATEO	53	29	0	0	4	0	122.0	78.0
		JUV SAN MATEO	21	0	1	0	1	0	123.0	20.0
		SAN MATEO NO MB	4	0	0	0	4	9	37.0	7.0
		SO SN FRANCISCO	1410	12	239	13	27	12	102.0	7.0
		REDWOOD CITY	1244	4	217	12	26	21	78.0	8.0
		TOTAL	2732	45	457	25	62	42	94.0	8.0
SANTA BARBARA	92.0%	JUV SNTA BARBRA	1	0	0	0	0	0	11.0	461.0
		JUV SNTA MARIA	2	0	0	0	0	0	83.0	9.0
		JUV S MARIA WST	8	0	0	0	0	0	34.0	23.0
		SNT BARBARA FIG	1292	42	224	48	19	8	60.0	14.0
		MILL S MARIA	845	69	19	44	9	2	37.0	20.0
		LOMPOC	180	11	10	4	2	1	39.0	21.0
		SUP SOLVANG	1	0	0	0	0	0	368.0	105.0
		TOTAL	2329	122	253	96	30	11	63.0	22.0
SANTA CLARA	87.3%	SANTA CLARA	134	142	3	0	2	0	95.0	54.0
		JUV SNTA CLARA	72	1	0	0	1	0	108.0	24.0
		PALO ALTO	951	5	113	18	13	0	79.0	14.0
		SAN JOSE	3823	39	457	78	44	2	58.0	4.0
		SAN JOSE TRAF	5	0	0	0	0	0	79.0	1.0
		PALO ALTO 2	5	2	0	0	0	0	40.0	19.0
		SAN MARTIN	660	6	107	9	7	1	78.0	4.0
		TOTAL	5650	195	680	105	68	3	70.0	6.0
SANTA CRUZ	82.2%	SANTA CRUZ	21	8	0	0	0	2	184.0	36.0
		JUV SANTA CRUZ	20	4	0	0	0	0	89.0	16.0
		TRAF SNTA CRUZ	1028	26	158	23	18	0	68.0	28.0
		WATSONVILLE	320	2	49	0	0	0	45.0	16.0
		TOTAL	1389	40	207	23	18	2	80.0	34.0
SHASTA	96.9%	JUV SHASTA	15	0	0	1	1	0	101.0	11.0
		BURNEY	75	1	6	1	1	0	79.0	9.0
		REDDING	1070	74	91	11	9	15	67.0	5.0
		TOTAL	1161	75	97	13	11	15	99.0	8.0
SIERRA	32.5%	SIERRA	25	1	14	2	0	0	80.0	34.0
		TOTAL	25	1	14	2	0	0	43.0	27.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SISKIYOU	80.3%	SISKIYOU	2	0	0	0	0	0	143.0	15.0
		JUV SISKIYOU	5	0	0	0	0	0	79.0	76.0
		DORRIS	2	0	0	0	0	0	96.0	34.0
		WEED	164	1	40	5	1	5	105.0	10.0
		YREKA	163	22	24	2	1	0	94.0	7.0
		TOTAL	336	23	64	7	2	5	69.0	6.0
		SOLANO	46	10	7	1	1	0	117.0	71.0
SOLANO	87.4%	JUV SOLANO	26	0	0	0	0	0	114.0	14.0
		FAIRFIELD	1155	11	187	20	15	16	76.0	36.0
		VALLEJO	410	16	37	4	7	14	122.0	40.0
		TOTAL	1637	37	231	25	23	30	93.0	37.0
		SONOMA	2460	108	689	51	15	0	49.0	13.0
SONOMA	77.5%	JUV SONOMA	47	3	5	0	0	0	59.0	26.0
		SANTA ROSA	4	0	0	0	4	49	117.0	35.0
		TOTAL	2511	111	694	51	19	49	49.0	14.0
		STANISLAUS	2038	34	185	35	19	3	75.0	33.0
		JUV STANISLAUS	27	2	0	1	0	0	91.0	204.0
STANISLAUS	74.9%	MODESTO	29	0	0	0	3	7	66.0	2.0
		TURLOCK	2	0	0	0	0	0	92.0	69.0
		TOTAL	2096	36	185	36	22	10	75.0	34.0
		TRAF YUBA CITY	422	22	92	3	3	6	55.0	31.0
		TOTAL	424	22	92	3	3	6	55.0	31.0
TEHAMA	53.2%	TEHAMA	9	13	1	0	0	0	102.0	16.0
		JUV TEHAMA	5	0	0	0	0	0	94.0	7.0
		CORNING	157	0	33	2	0	2	52.0	10.0
		RED BLUFF	207	7	44	8	1	2	49.0	8.0
		TOTAL	378	20	78	10	1	4	53.0	9.0
TRINITY	45.3%	TRINITY	83	3	20	0	0	2	64.0	15.0
		TOTAL	83	3	20	0	0	2	64.0	15.0
TULARE	77.8%	JUV VISALIA	27	0	0	0	1	0	128.0	19.0
		DINUBA	317	11	10	0	4	1	67.0	18.0
		PORTERVILLE	875	12	38	5	20	5	43.0	33.0
		TULARE	1285	3	34	3	29	2	45.0	89.0
		VISALIA DIV	122	52	2	0	4	12	82.0	26.0
TUOLUMNE	86.8%	TOTAL	2626	78	84	8	58	20	51.0	37.0
		TUOLUMNE	390	12	62	14	3	1	49.0	6.0
VENTURA	86.4%	TOTAL	390	12	62	14	3	1	49.0	6.0
		VENTURA	4408	81	1	6	64	56	68.0	1.0
YOLO	80.3%	TOTAL	4408	81	1	6	64	56	68.0	1.0
		YOLO	978	60	161	26	9	7	94.0	34.0
YOLO	80.3%	TOTAL	978	60	161	26	9	7	94.0	34.0



TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)*	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
YUBA	66.8%	YUBA	11	10	2	0	0	0	115.0	66.0
		JUV YUBA	3	0	0	0	1	0	148.0	12.0
		MARYSVILLE	419	10	102	3	1	2	78.0	64.0
		BEALE AFB	2	0	0	0	0	0	25.0	89.0
		TOTAL	435	20	104	3	2	2	78.0	64.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE			156595	95.9	73.5	63.4	18.9	0.2	4.8
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1303	98.5	97.6	74.0	1.5	0.0	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	351	99.1	94.3	15.7	21.9	0.0	28.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	74	95.9	78.4	4.1	14.9	0.0	17.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	52	86.5	94.2	7.7	15.4	0.0	3.8
		TOTAL	1780	98.1	96.1	57.6	6.5	0.0	7.4
	JUV OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	90.9	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	91.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
	ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	121	98.3	96.7	81.0	6.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	37	100.0	97.3	24.3	67.6	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		6	100.0	50.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
FREMONT	TOTAL	164	98.8	95.1	65.2	21.3	0.0	0.0	
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	530	99.2	98.7	86.8	1.9	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	144	100.0	100.0	17.4	63.2	0.0	0.7	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	43	100.0	97.7	4.7	65.1	0.0	2.3	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
PLEASANTON	TOTAL	723	99.3	98.9	67.4	17.8	0.0	0.3	
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	863	97.1	96.3	89.5	2.1	0.0	0.6	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	249	100.0	98.8	11.6	78.7	0.0	15.3	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	64	100.0	96.9	4.7	81.3	0.0	42.2	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	
HAYWARD	TOTAL	1180	97.9	96.9	68.1	22.8	0.0	6.1	
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1048	99.1	97.9	81.9	3.2	0.1	1.9	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	322	99.4	98.1	18.9	63.7	0.0	41.3	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	93	100.0	96.8	4.3	80.6	2.2	55.9	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	100.0	100.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	27.3	
ALPINE	TOTAL	1474	99.3	97.9	62.6	21.8	0.2	14.1	
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	90.9	72.7	90.9	0.0	0.0	9.1	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	33.3	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	TOTAL	15	86.7	80.0	73.3	13.3	0.0	20.0	
AMADOR	JUV AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	
	JACKSON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	201	96.0	98.5	91.0	3.0	0.0	13.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	61	98.4	98.4	6.6	85.2	0.0	68.9	
BUTTE	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	95.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	85.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	
	TOTAL	288	95.5	98.6	64.9	27.4	0.0	31.3	
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	849	94.2	94.1	88.2	1.6	0.0	1.4	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	284	89.8	95.8	16.9	69.7	0.0	5.6	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	95	88.4	90.5	4.2	74.7	0.0	20.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	41	56.1	90.2	0.0	36.6	9.8	36.6	
	TOTAL	1269	91.6	94.1	63.1	23.5	0.3	4.9	

\* Entries represent percentages of 2006 DUI convicteds receiving each sanction by county, court and offender status. Due to a law change, as of September 20, 2005, SB 1697, the percentages of license restrictions and court suspensions by county and offender status are no longer available in this Table. Statewide information on these sanctions is provided in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5.

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
BUTTE (cont.)	JUV BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	81.0	0.0	52.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	21	81.0	0.0	52.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CHICO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	64.3	64.3	64.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	GRIDLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	66.7	66.7	60.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	OROVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	8	87.5	87.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PARADISE	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	100.0	75.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
CALAVERAS	JUV CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	85.7	85.7	57.1	28.6	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	149	95.3	96.0	87.2	2.7	0.0	15.4
	TOTAL	TOTAL	53	100.0	100.0	15.1	83.0	0.0	41.5
	COLUSA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	17.6	76.5	0.0	64.7
	TOTAL	TOTAL	4	75.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
	CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	223	96.4	96.9	63.2	28.3	0.0	25.6
	TOTAL	TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COLUSA	JUV COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	3	66.7	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	50.0	100.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	8	25.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CONTRA COSTA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	10	20.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	117	93.2	97.4	82.9	2.6	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	41	95.1	97.6	34.1	51.2	0.0	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	JUV COLUSA	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	84.2	100.0	0.0	26.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	8	75.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	185	91.9	96.8	60.0	15.7	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	20	60.0	75.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
	CONTRA COSTA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	75.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	6.3
	TOTAL	TOTAL	14	71.4	100.0	0.0	35.7	0.0	7.1
	CONTRA COSTA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	72.7	95.5	0.0	36.4	0.0	9.1
	TOTAL	TOTAL	72	69.4	91.7	2.8	25.0	0.0	5.6
	MARTINEZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	40	5.0	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5
	TOTAL	TOTAL	40	5.0	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5
CONCORD	CONCORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	322	96.9	94.7	87.6	2.8	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	95	100.0	98.9	11.6	83.2	0.0	0.0
	CONCORD	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	20	100.0	95.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	TOTAL	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL			441	97.7	95.7	66.4	22.7	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
CONTRA COSTA (cont.)	RICHMOND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	455	97.6	96.7	86.4	3.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	150	100.0	100.0	12.7	78.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	97.8	100.0	0.0	73.3	0.0	2.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	665	97.4	97.7	62.0	25.6	0.0	0.2
PITTSBURG		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	562	98.0	92.3	90.0	2.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	207	98.1	98.1	14.5	77.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	64	90.6	96.9	0.0	68.8	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	72.7	100.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	844	97.2	94.2	63.5	27.0	0.0	0.0
WALNUT CREEK		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	912	97.9	94.7	92.8	2.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	264	99.2	94.3	14.4	74.6	0.0	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	75	98.7	97.3	1.3	86.7	0.0	2.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	85.7	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1258	98.2	94.8	70.3	22.7	0.0	0.2
DEL NORTE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	95	92.6	92.6	84.2	1.1	0.0	3.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	94.3	82.9	14.3	65.7	14.3	48.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	33.3	0.0	22.2	66.7	77.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0
		TOTAL	144	91.7	84.7	59.0	18.8	9.0	19.4
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	310	96.1	97.1	85.5	4.5	0.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	95	94.7	96.8	31.6	48.4	0.0	4.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	16.7	61.1	0.0	16.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	50.0	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	429	95.1	97.2	69.5	16.8	0.0	2.1
PLACERVILLE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	430	96.5	94.9	88.4	1.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	138	97.8	99.3	10.9	81.9	0.0	5.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	54	94.4	94.4	1.9	68.5	0.0	9.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	42.9	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	4.8
		TOTAL	643	94.9	96.0	61.6	25.0	0.0	2.2
FRESNO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	34	100.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	34	100.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FRESNO CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2777	94.5	97.2	86.5	2.7	0.0	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	951	93.3	99.1	18.2	69.2	0.0	9.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	266	89.1	98.5	6.4	73.7	0.8	19.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	131	53.4	100.0	3.1	31.3	0.0	4.6
CLOVIS		TOTAL	4125	92.6	97.8	63.0	23.5	0.0	4.4
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	304	97.7	99.0	93.8	2.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	104	98.1	97.1	13.5	81.7	0.0	3.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	95.5	100.0	0.0	81.8	0.0	22.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	40.0
COALINGA		TOTAL	435	97.7	98.6	68.7	26.4	0.0	2.5
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	124	96.8	92.7	77.4	15.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	93.9	100.0	27.3	63.6	0.0	3.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	165	95.2	94.5	64.8	26.1	0.0	0.6

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION		JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK	
				%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO	(cont.)	FIREBAUGH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	108	97.2	97.2	97.2	90.7	1.9	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	32	96.9	100.0	100.0	21.9	71.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		FOWLER	TOTAL	152	96.7	98.0	98.0	69.1	21.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	89.7	100.0	100.0	62.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	100.0	25.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	100.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	42	92.9	100.0	100.0	50.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0
		KERMAN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	38	100.0	97.4	97.4	92.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	100.0	100.0	100.0	12.5	81.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	60	98.3	98.3	98.3	61.7	28.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0
		KINGSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	185	97.3	97.3	97.3	85.9	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	91.5	97.9	97.9	17.0	72.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	83.3	91.7	91.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	55.6	100.0	100.0	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0
			TOTAL	253	94.1	97.2	97.2	66.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
		REEDLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	172	94.8	97.1	97.1	83.7	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	55	98.2	96.4	96.4	9.1	78.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.7	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	239	95.8	97.1	97.1	62.3	23.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
		SELMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	77.8	94.4	94.4	77.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	21	81.0	95.2	95.2	66.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		US CT FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	203	95.6	67.5	67.5	70.0	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	84	92.9	96.4	96.4	20.2	48.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	25	100.0	100.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	41.7	100.0	100.0	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		HUMBOLDT	TOTAL	324	93.2	78.7	78.7	50.9	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	459	96.5	28.5	28.5	86.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	149	96.6	87.2	87.2	11.4	69.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	91.9	89.2	89.2	2.7	73.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	59.5	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	63.6	81.8	81.8	9.1	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	0.0
		IMPERIAL	TOTAL	656	95.7	46.2	46.2	63.4	23.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.8	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	233	95.7	12.4	12.4	60.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	45	95.6	57.8	57.8	26.7	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	75.0	75.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	288	94.8	21.9	21.9	53.1	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION		JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK	
				%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
IMPERIAL	(cont.)	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	61	95.1	24.6	83.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	12	100.0	83.3	33.3	58.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	75	96.0	36.0	73.3	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	132	99.2	12.1	62.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	90.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	143	98.6	16.1	57.3	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	240	95.8	22.1	69.6	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	54	96.3	48.1	20.4	38.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
INYO		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	80.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	305	95.4	28.9	58.4	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	40.0	90.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KERN		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	161	93.8	29.2	85.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	87.5	85.4	12.5	60.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	100.0	92.3	7.7	76.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.8	53.8
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	223	92.4	45.3	64.6	20.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	4.9
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	100.0	15.0	81.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KERN		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	61	100.0	14.8	80.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	270	95.2	98.9	79.6	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	79	92.4	97.5	26.6	46.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	85.2	100.0	7.4	48.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.7
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	10	80.0	100.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	386	93.5	98.7	61.7	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1881	95.5	98.5	65.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	560	93.9	99.8	7.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.9	8.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	133	86.5	98.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	7.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	50	56.0	92.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
BAKERSFIELD		TOTAL	2624	93.9	98.6	48.6	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.8	2.8
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	136	97.8	85.3	77.2	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	95.5	97.7	13.6	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	93.8	100.0	12.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	8	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
		TOTAL	204	95.1	89.7	55.4	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
DELANO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	136	97.8	85.3	77.2	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	95.5	97.7	13.6	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	93.8	100.0	12.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	8	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
		TOTAL	204	95.1	89.7	55.4	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
		TOTAL	204	95.1	89.7	55.4	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION		JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK	
				%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
KERN	(cont.)	LAKE ISABELLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	100.0	96.7	43.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	100.0	93.8	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TAFT	TOTAL	91	97.8	96.7	28.6	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	113	93.8	97.3	68.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	100.0	97.1	8.8	70.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.9	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		SHAFTER	TOTAL	157	95.5	97.5	51.0	22.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.8	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	130	99.2	97.7	89.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	43	100.0	100.0	18.6	72.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		MOJAVE	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	184	98.9	98.4	67.4	21.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	286	97.9	97.9	66.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	75	94.7	100.0	9.3	29.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
KINGS		RIDGECREST	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	92.3	100.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	377	96.8	98.4	52.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
		JUV KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	124	98.4	98.4	63.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	45	95.6	100.0	20.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	100.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		HANFORD	TOTAL	184	97.3	98.9	47.8	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	14	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		AVENAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	593	91.9	97.6	77.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	171	86.5	96.5	22.2	51.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	44	63.6	95.5	6.8	29.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	10.5	89.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		CORCORAN	TOTAL	827	87.4	97.1	60.6	13.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	44	90.9	95.5	54.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	38.5	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		LEMOORE	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	60	90.0	96.7	48.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	49	93.9	100.0	79.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	14	85.7	100.0	50.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	66.7	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
			TOTAL	67	89.6	100.0	70.1	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
			1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			TOTAL	3	66.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION		JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK	
				%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LAKE	LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	185	91.4	56.2	77.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	43	90.7	90.7	18.6	62.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	95.0	95.0	5.0	45.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	250	91.2	65.6	60.8	15.6	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CLEARLAKE	CLEARLAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	113	97.3	27.4	77.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	41	100.0	70.7	17.1	51.2	14.6	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	90.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	167	97.6	43.1	56.9	16.2	4.2	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LASSEN	JUV LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUSANVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	154	97.4	98.1	81.8	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	97.9	97.9	43.8	45.8	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES	TOTAL	212	96.7	98.1	70.8	12.3	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	67	65.7	86.6	29.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	42	50.0	88.1	9.5	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	29.4	82.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	53	26.4	98.1	0.0	3.8	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
POMONA	POMONA	TOTAL	179	46.9	89.9	13.4	6.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1027	96.5	24.1	82.1	2.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	256	95.3	79.7	14.8	66.8	0.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	60	81.7	90.0	3.3	56.7	3.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	46	17.4	97.8	0.0	13.0	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LANCASTER	LANCASTER	TOTAL	1389	93.0	39.7	63.6	16.8	0.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	951	95.7	97.3	85.9	2.7	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	228	95.2	98.2	10.5	75.0	0.9	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	87.7	75.4	1.5	43.1	24.6	33.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	38.5	76.9	0.0	7.7	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN FERNANDO	SAN FERNANDO	TOTAL	1257	94.6	96.1	67.0	18.0	1.7	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1262	96.8	51.5	71.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	344	94.2	93.9	6.1	75.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	86.8	90.1	1.1	53.8	9.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	28	10.7	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PASADENA	PASADENA	TOTAL	1725	94.3	62.7	53.8	21.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	656	98.2	56.7	87.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	152	99.3	92.8	13.8	79.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	93.3	82.2	0.0	60.0	17.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	55.6	77.8	11.1	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
VAN NUYS	VAN NUYS	TOTAL	862	97.7	64.6	69.3	17.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2256	98.1	43.4	86.7	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	440	96.4	95.2	10.2	75.9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	110	89.1	93.6	5.5	28.2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	36	25.0	97.2	0.0	8.3	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2842	96.6	54.1	70.6	15.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	LONG BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1144	97.3	23.2	76.9	2.1	0.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	298	96.0	73.2	8.7	64.4	2.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	96.9	46.2	1.5	27.7	47.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	63.6	54.5	9.1	9.1	36.4	0.0
		TOTAL	1518	96.8	34.2	59.8	15.5	3.2	0.0
	COMPTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	849	97.5	49.2	74.0	2.4	0.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	191	94.2	85.9	20.9	63.9	1.0	0.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	43	93.0	86.0	14.0	69.8	4.7	4.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	26	50.0	92.3	3.8	19.2	3.8	0.0
		TOTAL	1109	95.7	58.0	60.9	16.0	0.6	0.3
	NORWALK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	38	68.4	86.8	39.5	5.3	2.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	17	23.5	82.4	5.9	5.9	5.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	20	15.0	85.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0
		TOTAL	84	40.5	86.9	17.9	3.6	6.0	0.0
	TORRANCE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1092	97.9	21.0	92.5	1.6	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	308	95.1	87.0	11.0	75.6	0.3	0.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	67	85.1	92.5	0.0	62.7	3.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	29	41.4	96.6	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0
		TOTAL	1496	95.7	39.2	69.8	19.7	0.3	0.1
	SANTA MONICA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	44.4	88.9	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	29	51.7	86.2	10.3	3.4	3.4	0.0
	JUV LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LOS ANGELES DLQ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	100.0	0.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	19	100.0	0.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1062	98.0	23.8	85.5	2.0	0.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	246	98.4	90.2	7.7	80.9	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	52	86.5	88.5	1.9	28.8	9.6	0.0
	LOS ANGELES AIRPRT	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	56.3	100.0	6.3	12.5	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1376	97.2	39.0	67.5	17.2	0.4	0.0
	ALHAMBRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	494	98.2	12.8	76.3	1.0	0.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	122	98.4	86.9	10.7	75.4	0.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	95.2	81.0	0.0	38.1	19.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	71.4	0.0	28.6	28.6	0.0
		TOTAL	644	97.8	29.7	60.6	16.6	1.1	0.3
	BEVERLY HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	276	100.0	49.6	94.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	42	97.6	85.7	23.8	66.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	100.0	69.2	7.7	61.5	23.1	0.0
		TOTAL	331	99.7	55.0	81.9	10.9	0.9	0.0
	BURBANK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	267	99.3	38.6	72.7	2.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	58	98.3	93.1	10.3	82.8	0.0	5.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	33.3	0.0	22.2	66.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	339	98.8	48.7	59.0	17.1	1.8	0.9

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL		PROBATION	JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%		%	%		%	%		%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	WEST COVINA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1508		98.5	18.8		92.0	1.1		0.0		0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	371		98.4	89.8		10.0	80.9		0.3		2.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	88		100.0	92.0		5.7	77.3		4.5		8.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7		100.0	42.9		14.3	42.9		42.9		0.0
		TOTAL	1974		98.6	35.5		72.5	19.6		0.4		1.1
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6		16.7	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
	CHATSWORTH	TOTAL	6		16.7	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	920		97.5	40.1		75.5	3.3		0.2		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	196		96.9	87.8		13.8	71.9		1.5		1.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41		90.2	70.7		2.4	51.2		22.0		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4		50.0	100.0		0.0	50.0		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	1161		97.0	49.4		62.3	16.7		1.2		0.2
	EAST LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	928		97.5	27.9		87.9	2.5		0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	232		94.8	69.4		24.6	56.5		0.0		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	59		91.5	81.4		6.8	44.1		10.2		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5		80.0	100.0		0.0	80.0		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	1224		96.7	38.6		71.7	15.0		0.5		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	575		97.9	35.1		84.7	2.3		0.0		0.0
	EL MONTE	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	139		99.3	88.5		15.1	70.5		1.4		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	31		100.0	80.6		3.2	67.7		16.1		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1		0.0	100.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	746		98.1	47.1		68.2	17.7		0.9		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	416		98.6	22.4		90.9	1.2		0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	85		97.6	83.5		11.8	74.1		0.0		2.4
	INGLEWOOD	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27		100.0	85.2		18.5	70.4		3.7		3.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6		83.3	100.0		0.0	66.7		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	534		98.3	36.1		73.6	17.0		0.2		0.6
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	216		97.2	19.0		77.3	3.2		0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	52		96.2	80.8		30.8	53.8		0.0		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11		90.9	54.5		18.2	18.2		36.4		0.0
	LA METRO	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4		25.0	100.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	283		95.8	32.9		65.4	13.1		1.4		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4468		98.2	41.9		82.4	5.1		0.0		0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	940		98.8	93.8		8.4	84.4		0.1		2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	194		97.9	96.9		2.1	79.4		1.5		6.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11		81.8	81.8		9.1	45.5		0.0		0.0
	BELLFLOWER	TOTAL	5613		98.3	52.6		67.1	21.1		0.1		0.9
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	504		98.8	17.9		78.4	2.2		0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	114		100.0	86.8		10.5	78.9		0.9		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19		100.0	78.9		5.3	26.3		21.1		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3		100.0	100.0		0.0	33.3		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	640		99.1	32.3		63.8	16.7		0.8		0.0
	SANTA CLARITA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	694		97.4	23.6		73.1	2.6		0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	182		94.0	87.9		7.7	65.9		0.0		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36		88.9	91.7		0.0	36.1		5.6		2.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9		33.3	100.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	921		95.8	39.7		56.6	16.4		0.2		0.1

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	MALIBU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	237	98.3	4.2	84.8	1.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	49	93.9	81.6	14.3	69.4	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	54.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	300	97.3	19.3	69.7	14.7	1.7	0.0
	HUNTINGTON PARK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	WHITTIER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	503	96.8	21.5	81.9	2.2	0.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	104	99.0	84.6	11.5	79.8	1.0	6.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	89.7	93.1	0.0	69.0	3.4	17.2
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HOLLYWOOD	TOTAL	638	96.6	35.3	66.5	17.9	0.3	2.2
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	123	97.6	17.9	82.1	1.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	100.0	77.4	19.4	67.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	162	98.1	33.3	66.0	18.5	0.0	0.0
	SAN PEDRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LOS ANGELES PURD	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MADERA	AVALON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	57	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	22.2	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0	11.1
		TOTAL	66	4.5	1.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
	MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	36	86.1	91.7	77.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	11	72.7	90.9	9.1	27.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	62.5	87.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	8	50.0	87.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0
		TOTAL	63	76.2	90.5	46.0	9.5	3.2	0.0
	JUV MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	100.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	100.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	350	94.3	97.7	86.6	2.6	0.0	0.0
	CHOWCHILLA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	119	95.0	99.2	23.5	63.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	84.2	94.7	10.5	68.4	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	497	94.0	98.0	67.0	21.1	0.0	0.0
	MADERA CRIM	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	95.0	95.0	85.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	80.0	90.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	30	90.0	93.3	60.0	23.3	0.0	0.0
BASS LAKE SIERRA	BASS LAKE SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	75	98.7	97.3	97.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	93.9	93.9	12.1	72.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	90.9	81.8	9.1	54.5	18.2	9.1
		4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	124	96.8	95.2	62.9	26.6	1.6	0.8

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
MARIN	SUP SAN RAFAEL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1050	97.4	10.9	90.3	2.6	0.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	241	99.2	87.1	5.0	81.3	0.0	9.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	64	100.0	93.8	3.1	29.7	0.0	40.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	95.2	100.0	0.0	52.4	0.0	57.1
MARIPOSA	SUP MARIPOSA	TOTAL	1376	97.8	29.4	69.9	18.4	0.0	4.9
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	68	97.1	92.6	63.2	14.7	0.0	1.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	24	91.7	91.7	37.5	37.5	0.0	8.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
MENDOCINO	SUP UKIAH	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	102	95.1	93.1	51.0	25.5	0.0	3.9
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	66.7	16.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	JUV MENDOCINO	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	66.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	75.0	87.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	19	78.9	94.7	21.1	31.6	0.0	15.8
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WILLITS	TOTAL	10	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	86	94.2	97.7	82.6	1.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	100.0	17.5	72.5	0.0	27.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	85.7	92.9	7.1	71.4	0.0	21.4
	UKIAH	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
		TOTAL	145	93.1	97.9	54.5	28.3	0.0	10.3
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	446	93.3	95.3	87.2	3.1	0.0	2.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	159	94.3	98.7	16.4	73.0	0.0	49.7
	POINT ARENA	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	38	100.0	97.4	2.6	84.2	0.0	86.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	57.1	0.0	42.9
		TOTAL	650	94.0	96.3	64.2	25.5	0.0	19.4
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
	COVELO	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	4	100.0	100.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	16	100.0	100.0	93.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	42.9
	FORT BRAGG	TOTAL	23	100.0	100.0	65.2	30.4	0.0	13.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	97	94.8	95.9	75.3	1.0	0.0	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	15.4	61.5	0.0	38.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	55.6
	SUP MERCED	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	120	95.0	96.7	62.5	12.5	0.0	9.2
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MERCED JUV	TOTAL	2	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	17	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	17	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	788	97.7	96.7	88.5	3.9	0.0	0.0
	MERCED	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	245	97.6	96.7	22.9	69.8	0.4	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	57	93.0	96.5	14.0	70.2	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	71.4	95.2	4.8	42.9	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1111	96.9	96.7	68.6	22.6	0.1	0.1

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	
MERCED	(cont.)	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	258	98.4	97.7	91.1	3.1	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	62	100.0	100.0	38.7	54.8	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	14.3	52.4	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	343	98.8	98.3	76.4	15.5	0.0	0.0	
MODOC	ALTURAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	52	100.0	46.2	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	86.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	57.1	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	76	93.4	50.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
MONO	MONO	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		BRIDGEPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	100.0	76.2	95.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MAMMOTH LAKES	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	29	96.6	82.8	69.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	78	100.0	50.0	97.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	18	94.4	94.4	5.6	83.3	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	
MONTEREY	MONTEREY	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	100	98.0	60.0	77.0	17.0	0.0	1.0	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	78	93.6	89.7	53.8	2.6	0.0	17.9	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	82.4	97.1	2.9	50.0	0.0	44.1	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	90.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	
	JUV MONTEREY	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	24	66.7	100.0	0.0	20.8	0.0	41.7	
		TOTAL	146	86.3	93.2	29.5	18.5	0.0	30.1	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	10.5	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	MARINA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	21	19.0	19.0	9.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	
		SALINAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1481	99.7	99.4	62.7	2.0	0.0	11.2
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	375	99.5	99.5	9.1	62.4	0.0	76.3
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	90	100.0	100.0	4.4	38.9	0.0	88.9
	KING CITY	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	
		TOTAL	1950	99.6	99.4	49.5	15.4	0.0	27.4	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	219	99.1	99.1	84.0	1.8	0.0	3.2	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	87	97.7	100.0	16.1	63.2	0.0	46.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	0.0	58.8	0.0	88.2	
NAPA	NAPA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	88.9	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	
		TOTAL	332	98.5	99.1	59.6	20.8	0.0	19.9	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	675	96.1	90.8	88.7	2.8	0.0	1.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	194	97.9	99.0	19.6	76.8	0.0	27.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	46	93.5	97.8	6.5	78.3	0.0	56.5	
	TOTAL	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	61.5	92.3	0.0	46.2	0.0	7.7	
		TOTAL	928	95.9	92.9	69.0	22.6	0.0	10.0	

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
NEVADA	NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	100.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	18	100.0	94.4	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	JUV TRUCKEE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		NEVADA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	238	98.3	96.2	95.0	0.8	0.0	0.4
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	98	99.0	100.0	12.2	82.7	0.0	10.2
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	25	100.0	96.0	0.0	72.0	0.0	40.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1		100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0		
TOTAL	362		98.6	97.2	65.7	28.2	0.0	5.8		
ORANGE	TRUCKEE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	152	98.7	97.4	94.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	100.0	98.0	23.5	74.5	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	23.1	69.2	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	216	99.1	97.7	73.1	23.6	0.0	0.0	
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	77	92.2	13.0	72.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	JUV ORANGE	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	80	92.5	16.2	70.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	
		FULLERTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2602	99.0	47.7	92.8	2.0	0.0	1.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	641	98.4	91.3	8.0	80.8	0.0	37.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	158	95.6	96.8	0.6	83.5	0.0	51.9
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	35		54.3	97.1	2.9	34.3	0.0	5.7		
TOTAL	3436		98.3	58.6	71.8	20.8	0.0	10.1		
WESTMINSTER	WESTMINSTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2736	98.5	15.8	90.7	1.6	0.0	0.5	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	736	97.4	91.7	6.7	79.3	0.0	15.1	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	183	97.8	95.6	0.0	79.2	0.0	48.6	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	48	52.1	97.9	0.0	41.7	0.0	27.1	
		TOTAL	3703	97.7	35.9	68.3	21.4	0.0	6.1	
	LAGUNA HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	874	99.3	20.7	92.1	1.1	0.0	0.3	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	175	100.0	86.3	10.3	75.4	0.0	10.9	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	96.7	86.7	3.3	66.7	3.3	33.3	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	50.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	
		TOTAL	1089	98.9	33.8	75.7	15.1	0.1	3.0	
LAGUNA NIGUEL	LAGUNA NIGUEL	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		NEWPORT BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2707	97.9	41.7	90.5	1.1	0.0	0.3
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	733	98.2	94.3	6.1	80.6	0.0	6.7
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	183	96.7	96.7	3.8	81.4	0.0	15.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		30	63.3	100.0	0.0	43.3	0.0	3.3	
	TOTAL		3653	97.6	55.5	68.5	21.5	0.0	2.4	
	SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1813	98.6	43.7	92.7	1.7	0.0	0.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	463	97.0	91.8	9.9	78.4	0.0	25.7	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	89	92.1	95.5	3.4	78.7	0.0	51.7	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		30	56.7	100.0	3.3	46.7	0.0	13.3		
TOTAL		2395	97.5	55.7	72.2	20.0	0.0	7.5		

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
PLACER	JUV PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	35	97.1	42.9	34.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	36	97.2	44.4	36.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PLUMAS	JUV TAHOE VISTA	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1546	98.6	98.6	20.1	2.2	0.0	2.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	394	97.7	99.5	10.7	75.6	0.0	56.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	105	83.8	97.1	11.4	65.7	0.0	60.0
RIVERSIDE	TAHOE CITY	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	37	40.5	100.0	2.7	32.4	0.0	32.4
		TOTAL	2082	96.6	98.7	17.6	19.8	0.0	16.5
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	156	99.4	99.4	77.6	1.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	100.0	95.7	2.1	80.9	0.0	0.0
QUINCY	TAHOE CITY	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	10.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	214	99.1	98.6	57.0	22.0	0.0	0.5
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	146	97.3	95.9	85.6	6.8	0.0	0.0
RIVERSIDE	QUINCY	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	100.0	100.0	18.2	79.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	94.4	0.0	5.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	25.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	212	96.2	97.2	62.7	29.7	0.0	0.5
INDIO	RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	177	69.5	98.3	61.0	2.8	0.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	64	60.9	96.9	14.1	42.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	60.0	100.0	6.7	40.0	0.0	3.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	63	49.2	98.4	4.8	36.5	0.0	0.0
JUV RIVERSIDE	INDIO	TOTAL	334	63.2	98.2	36.5	20.1	0.0	0.6
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1206	95.9	90.9	89.9	2.0	0.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	276	92.8	97.5	17.0	71.4	0.0	6.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	68	92.6	100.0	13.2	67.6	0.0	4.4
JUV MURRIETA	INDIO	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	42	57.1	100.0	2.4	47.6	0.0	9.5
		TOTAL	1592	94.2	92.7	71.7	18.0	0.0	1.8
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	11	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HEMET	JUV MURRIETA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	8	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2465	97.8	96.9	90.7	1.5	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	569	97.4	97.9	15.6	77.7	0.0	7.7
BANNING	HEMET	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	137	92.7	98.5	8.0	78.8	0.0	13.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	84.6	100.0	7.7	69.2	0.0	15.4
		TOTAL	3184	97.5	97.2	73.4	18.8	0.0	2.1
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	352	98.9	93.8	92.3	0.9	0.0	0.3
BLYTHE	BANNING	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	82	100.0	97.6	13.4	75.6	0.0	3.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	100.0	17.6	76.5	0.0	11.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	452	98.9	94.7	75.0	17.3	0.0	1.3
BLYTHE	BLYTHE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	99	96.0	61.6	91.9	1.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	18	94.4	83.3	16.7	77.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	121	95.9	66.1	77.7	15.7	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
RIVERSIDE (cont.)	MURRIETA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1755	98.9	93.4	96.6	1.1	0.0	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	431	98.4	97.4	13.7	82.1	0.0	8.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	89	96.6	97.8	4.5	89.9	0.0	24.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	26	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	19.2
SACRAMENTO	TEMECULA	TOTAL	2301	98.7	94.4	76.4	20.9	0.0	3.8
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	103	80.6	94.2	28.2	10.7	0.0	0.0
	SACRAMENTO	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	66	74.2	100.0	7.6	36.4	0.0	7.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	44	70.5	97.7	2.3	38.6	0.0	4.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	118	69.5	100.0	2.5	41.5	0.0	5.9
		TOTAL	331	74.0	97.9	11.5	30.5	0.0	4.2
	JUV SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	58	93.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	58	93.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SACRAMENTO CM	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3996	97.5	97.8	91.3	2.4	0.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1249	99.4	99.7	8.0	85.2	0.0	3.8
SAN BENITO	US DIST COURT	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	349	99.1	99.4	2.6	72.8	0.0	10.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	31	90.3	100.0	0.0	61.3	0.0	12.9
		TOTAL	5625	98.0	98.3	66.8	25.5	0.0	1.7
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SAN BENITO	TOTAL	5	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	237	96.2	90.7	54.0	0.4	0.0	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	85	98.8	98.8	5.9	42.4	0.0	25.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	87.5	100.0	6.3	18.8	0.0	68.8
	JUV SAN BENITO	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	347	95.7	93.4	38.6	11.5	0.0	10.4
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO	TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	55	72.7	87.3	50.9	5.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	23	82.6	95.7	26.1	52.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	55.6	88.9	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0
	RNCHO CUCAMNGA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	20	75.0	85.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	107	73.8	88.8	32.7	23.4	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	36	61.1	94.4	30.6	22.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	88.9	88.9	22.2	66.7	0.0	0.0
	VICTORVILLE	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	50.0	100.0	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	61	65.6	95.1	23.0	27.9	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	965	94.0	70.4	86.5	1.7	0.0	0.0
BARSTOW	BARSTOW	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	301	95.0	89.4	19.3	70.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	96	90.6	99.0	7.3	72.9	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	38	50.0	89.5	0.0	23.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1400	92.8	76.9	64.3	22.0	0.0	0.0
	BARSTOW	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	326	98.5	66.3	90.2	0.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	87	96.6	92.0	12.6	21.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	100.0	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	56.3	100.0	0.0	43.8	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	441	96.6	73.5	69.2	7.0	0.0	0.0



TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)	JUV SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	100.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	100.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV TRAF R CUCMNGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV R CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	17	94.1	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	17	94.1	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	6.7	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	15	100.0	6.7	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CHINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	315	98.1	42.2	92.1	1.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	85	96.5	85.9	11.8	75.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	100.0	95.5	0.0	54.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	55.6	88.9	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	431	97.0	54.5	69.8	19.3	0.0	0.0
	REDLANDS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	176	99.4	7.4	97.2	0.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	32	100.0	75.0	15.6	81.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	213	99.5	19.2	83.6	13.1	0.0	0.0
	SN BERNARDINO DIV	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1834	97.3	66.2	91.4	1.6	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	494	97.2	92.3	18.8	73.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	145	93.1	96.6	6.9	50.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	24	79.2	100.0	4.2	16.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2497	96.8	73.5	71.3	18.7	0.0	0.0
	FONTANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	753	95.2	91.0	89.4	2.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	218	94.0	97.7	14.7	76.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	59	89.8	100.0	0.0	37.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	52.6	94.7	0.0	26.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1049	93.9	92.9	67.2	20.0	0.0	0.0
	R CUCAMONGA DIST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1935	98.0	31.0	94.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	464	98.3	90.7	13.4	80.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	119	95.0	100.0	0.8	25.2	0.0	0.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	17	70.6	100.0	11.8	11.8	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2535	97.7	45.6	74.3	16.9	0.0	0.0
	BIG BEAR LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	129	97.7	45.7	93.0	3.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	37	97.3	91.9	5.4	86.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	100.0	0.0	64.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	182	97.8	59.9	67.0	25.8	0.0	0.0
	TWIN PEAKS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	27	100.0	3.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	66.7	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	30	100.0	10.0	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0
	SUP NEEDLES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	99	90.9	69.7	79.8	0.0	1.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	84.6	76.9	69.2	15.4	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	117	88.9	70.9	76.1	2.6	1.7	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL		JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)	JOSHUA TREE DIST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	177	95.5	72.9	88.1	2.3			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	54	88.9	88.9	22.2	55.6			0.0		0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	83.3			0.0		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6		66.7	0.0	33.3			0.0		16.7
		TOTAL	255	92.9	78.0	65.9	20.0			0.0		0.4
	SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	165	85.5	75.2	60.6	1.2			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	80.9	93.6	8.5	31.9			0.0		6.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	53.6	96.4	3.6	7.1			0.0		3.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	39	33.3	100.0	5.1	0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	279	74.2	83.9	38.4	6.8			0.0		1.4
	VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3538	97.0	17.4	78.1	1.6			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1041	94.4	80.4	8.4	56.8			0.0		1.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	261	89.7	95.0	1.9	63.2			0.0		3.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	76	39.5	98.7	7.9	25.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	4916	95.2	36.1	58.2	16.9			0.0		0.5
	JUV SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	97	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	99	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
	EL CAJON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1812	97.1	41.4	92.0	1.8			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	520	96.3	89.8	14.2	75.2			0.0		2.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	106	95.3	95.3	1.9	74.5			0.9		4.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	34	82.4	94.1	0.0	50.0			0.0		2.9
	VISTA2	TOTAL	2472	96.6	54.6	70.5	21.0			0.0		0.7
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
	SAN DIEGO KEARNY	TOTAL	22	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4444	97.9	30.9	94.4	1.7			0.0		0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	881	98.2	79.0	16.6	71.1			0.0		7.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	193	96.9	93.8	6.2	86.0			1.0		43.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	100.0	100.0	9.1	90.9			0.0		18.2
	CHULA VISTA	TOTAL	5540	97.9	41.0	78.6	16.0			0.0		3.1
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1527	94.8	9.8	84.7	1.1			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	326	97.2	77.3	17.8	62.3			0.0		1.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	90.8	86.2	4.6	47.7			0.0		1.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	48.1	100.0	0.0	29.6			0.0		11.1
	SAN FRANCISCO	TOTAL	1945	94.4	24.9	69.6	13.3			0.0		0.4
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	50.0	83.3	50.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0			0.0		75.0
		TOTAL	10	50.0	90.0	30.0	20.0			0.0		30.0
	JUV SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0
	TRAF SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	727	99.2	98.6	94.8	2.6			0.0		3.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	160	98.8	98.8	20.6	74.4			1.2		41.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	96.4	96.4	10.7	78.6			3.6		71.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0			0.0		60.0
		TOTAL	920	99.0	98.6	78.8	17.9			0.3		12.8

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
SAN JOAQUIN	JUV SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	25	100.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	25	100.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	392	98.7	97.7	88.5	1.8	0.0	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	127	96.9	99.2	13.4	73.2	0.0	15.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	46	100.0	97.8	2.2	45.7	0.0	19.6
	LODI	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	18	66.7	100.0	5.6	27.8	0.0	27.8
		TOTAL	583	97.4	98.1	62.8	21.6	0.0	6.3
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	363	99.7	97.8	93.1	1.7	0.0	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	117	99.1	98.3	13.7	77.8	0.0	45.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	100.0	96.6	3.4	86.2	3.4	72.4
	MANTECA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	85.7	90.5	4.8	76.2	0.0	61.9
		TOTAL	530	99.1	97.5	26.1	26.1	0.2	18.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	219	99.5	98.2	89.5	2.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	71	97.2	98.6	16.9	74.6	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	90.9	81.8	9.1	50.0	18.2	9.1
	TRACY	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	317	98.1	96.5	66.2	22.4	1.6	0.6
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1333	98.2	97.7	91.7	3.0	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	424	97.4	99.3	10.4	85.6	0.0	15.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	128	89.8	98.4	2.3	82.0	0.0	27.3
	STOCKTON	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	77	79.2	89.6	1.3	58.4	0.0	14.3
		TOTAL	1962	96.7	97.8	64.8	28.2	0.0	6.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SAN LUIS OBISPO	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1476	97.8	95.5	90.4	1.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	432	98.1	99.3	12.0	81.0	0.0	0.0
	S LUIS OBISPO MONT	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	131	94.7	99.2	9.9	74.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	40	72.5	100.0	10.0	27.5	0.0	2.5
		TOTAL	2079	97.2	96.6	67.5	23.3	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PASO ROBLES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	75.9	89.7	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19	47.4	100.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	40.0	100.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	24	29.2	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	82	51.2	96.3	3.7	6.1	0.0	0.0
	SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	100.0	4.8	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1102	97.7	97.1	92.6	2.1	0.0	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	266	100.0	99.6	6.0	90.6	0.0	44.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	51	96.1	100.0	0.0	88.2	0.0	25.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	1422	98.1	97.7	72.9	21.9	0.0	10.1
	SAN MATEO NO MB	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1102	97.7	97.1	92.6	2.1	0.0	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	266	100.0	99.6	6.0	90.6	0.0	44.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	51	96.1	100.0	0.0	88.2	0.0	25.5
	SO SAN FRANCISCO	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	1422	98.1	97.7	72.9	21.9	0.0	10.1

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL		PROBATION	JAIL		1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN MATEO (cont.)	REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	958		97.2	98.4	93.2		2.8			0.0		0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	245		98.0	100.0	10.2		84.5			0.0		4.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41		90.2	97.6	9.8		70.7			0.0		4.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4		75.0	100.0			50.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	1248		97.0	98.7	73.9		21.2			0.0		1.3
SANTA BARBARA	JUV SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1		100.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	1		100.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
	JUV SANTA MARIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2		100.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	2		100.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
	JUV S MARIA WEST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8		87.5	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	8		87.5	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
	SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1017		94.5	79.0	9.5		0.8			0.0		0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	230		97.0	95.2	0.9		77.4			0.0		6.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	77		98.7	94.8	0.0		85.7			0.0		16.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10		90.0	90.0	0.0		50.0			0.0		10.0
SANTA CLARA	SUP SANTA MARIA	TOTAL	1334		95.1	82.8	7.4		19.3			0.0		2.2
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	618		97.6	50.5	7.4		2.6			0.0		0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	203		96.1	94.6	0.5		72.4			0.0		4.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	78		87.2	96.2	0.0		70.5			0.0		11.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15		40.0	100.0	0.0		33.3			0.0		0.0
		TOTAL	914		95.4	65.0	5.1		24.4			0.0		2.2
	LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	136		98.5	32.4	5.9		1.5			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	42		97.6	85.7	0.0		64.3			0.0		2.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10		90.0	100.0	0.0		80.0			0.0		20.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3		0.0	100.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
SANTA CLARA	SOLVANG	TOTAL	191		96.3	48.7	4.2		19.4			0.0		1.6
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
	SANTA CLARA	TOTAL	1		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	102		74.5	98.0	52.9		7.8			1.0		2.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	63		66.7	100.0	6.3		44.4			0.0		6.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28		60.7	100.0	3.6		50.0			0.0		7.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	83		60.2	98.8	0.0		47.0			0.0		14.5
		TOTAL	276		67.0	98.9	21.4		32.2			0.4		7.6
	JUV SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	68		97.1	1.5	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5		100.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
SANTA CLARA	PALO ALTO	TOTAL	73		97.3	1.4	0.0		0.0			0.0		0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	745		99.6	97.0	93.4		2.7			0.0		1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	169		98.8	100.0	16.0		75.7			0.0		43.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	38		100.0	100.0	10.5		63.2			0.0		68.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4		100.0	100.0	0.0		50.0			0.0		100.0
		TOTAL	956		99.5	97.7	76.0		18.2			0.0		12.1
	SAN JOSE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2900		99.6	98.5	93.8		4.1			0.0		2.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	776		99.9	100.0	13.5		82.3			0.0		31.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	177		99.4	99.4	1.7		78.5			0.0		59.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9		88.9	100.0	0.0		55.6			0.0		77.8
		TOTAL	3862		99.6	98.8	73.3		23.4			0.0		11.2

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SANTA CLARA (cont.)	SAN JOSE TRAF  PALO ALTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0
	SAN MARTIN	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	28.6
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	475	98.1	97.3	78.7	0.4	0.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	152	99.3	100.0	12.5	57.9	0.0	42.1
	SANTA CRUZ	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	100.0	100.0	0.0	26.5	0.0	70.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
TOTAL		666	98.5	98.0	59.0	14.9	0.0	14.1	
1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI		6	83.3	83.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	81.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	29	79.3	96.6	10.3	6.9	0.0	0.0
	JUV SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22	100.0	9.1	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	24	100.0	8.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	727	98.2	97.4	80.2	0.8	0.0	0.0
	TRAF SNTA CRUZ	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	246	98.4	98.0	11.0	53.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	60	95.0	98.3	3.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		21	81.0	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		1054	97.7	97.6	58.1	14.5	0.0	0.0	
SHASTA	WATSONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	219	99.1	99.1	54.8	1.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	71	100.0	100.0	2.8	42.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	96.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV SHASTA	TOTAL	322	98.8	99.4	37.9	10.2	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	80.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	15	80.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	47	100.0	97.9	95.7	0.0	0.0	6.4
	BURNEY	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	23	95.7	100.0	4.3	91.3	0.0	82.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL		76	98.7	98.7	60.5	27.6	0.0	36.8	
1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI		741	94.7	97.6	89.1	1.8	0.0	11.9	
SIERRA	REDDING	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	290	95.5	97.9	10.7	76.9	0.3	74.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	84.6	96.7	1.1	23.1	0.0	69.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	40.9	100.0	4.5	9.1	0.0	13.6
		TOTAL	1144	93.1	97.6	60.6	22.6	0.1	32.3
	US DIST REDDING	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	100.0	100.0	84.2	15.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	16.7	83.3	0.0	0.0
	SIERRA	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	26	100.0	100.0	65.4	34.6	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION		JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM		18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM		30-MONTH PROGRAM		IGNITION INTERLOCK
				%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	
SISKIYOU	SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	JUV SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	DORRIS	TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	100	95.0	86.0	86.0	82.0	82.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WEED	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	54	98.1	96.3	96.3	24.1	24.1	68.5	68.5	0.0	0.0	22.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
SOLANO	YREKA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	165	95.8	90.3	90.3	57.6	57.6	29.7	29.7	0.0	0.0	10.9
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	135	94.8	97.8	97.8	80.7	80.7	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	96.0	100.0	100.0	28.0	28.0	64.0	64.0	0.0	0.0	28.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	86.7	100.0	100.0	20.0	20.0	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	46.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	40.0	60.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
		TOTAL	185	91.4	96.2	96.2	64.3	64.3	15.7	15.7	0.0	0.0	9.7
	SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	27	88.9	100.0	100.0	81.5	81.5	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	68.8	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	68.8	68.8	0.0	0.0	25.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	60.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	50.0	100.0	100.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SONOMA	JUV SOLANO	TOTAL	56	75.0	100.0	100.0	41.1	41.1	30.4	30.4	0.0	0.0	7.1
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	24	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	26	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FAIRFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	808	96.3	96.5	96.5	90.8	90.8	2.8	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	257	94.9	99.6	99.6	12.1	12.1	80.9	80.9	0.0	0.0	5.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	86	87.2	95.3	95.3	3.5	3.5	75.6	75.6	0.0	0.0	8.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	46.7	93.3	93.3	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	13.3
	VALLEJO	TOTAL	1166	94.7	97.1	97.1	65.9	65.9	25.6	25.6	0.0	0.0	2.7
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	283	96.5	97.9	97.9	91.2	91.2	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	94	97.9	98.9	98.9	25.5	25.5	69.1	69.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	39	87.2	100.0	100.0	5.1	5.1	76.9	76.9	0.0	0.0	5.1
SONOMA	SONOMA	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	50.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	426	94.8	98.4	98.4	66.7	66.7	25.1	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1764	96.5	91.5	91.5	64.3	64.3	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	585	93.7	98.8	98.8	6.5	6.5	44.1	44.1	0.0	0.0	9.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	153	87.6	100.0	100.0	1.3	1.3	17.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	27.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	66	57.6	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	7.6	0.0	0.0	12.1
		TOTAL	2568	94.4	93.9	93.9	45.8	45.8	11.6	11.6	0.0	0.0	4.6
	JUV SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	48	45.8	10.4	10.4	37.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SANTA ROSA	SANTA ROSA	TOTAL	50	46.0	12.0	12.0	38.0	38.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STANISLAUS	STANISLAUS	1ST DUI	1486	99.1	98.0	84.1	5.5	0.1	0.4
		2ND DUI	443	98.6	99.3	19.4	69.3	0.0	5.4
		3RD DUI	104		100.0	7.7	74.0	0.0	10.6
		4TH+ DUI	39	79.5	97.4	5.1	56.4	2.6	17.9
		TOTAL	2072	98.6	98.4	65.0	23.6	0.1	2.3
JUV STANISLAUS	JUV STANISLAUS	1ST DUI	27	96.3	0.0	63.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2ND DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	29	96.6	0.0	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1ST DUI	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2ND DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SUTTER	TURLOCK	TOTAL	29	3.4	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1ST DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1ST DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2ND DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TEHAMA	TRAF YUBA CITY	TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1ST DUI	315	92.7	97.1	89.2	0.6	0.3	2.5
		2ND DUI	89	91.0	100.0	18.0	70.8	0.0	44.9
		3RD DUI	31	100.0	100.0	9.7	80.6	0.0	77.4
		4TH+ DUI	9	44.4	100.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	0.0
TEHAMA	TEHAMA	TOTAL	444	91.9	98.0	67.6	21.2	0.2	16.2
		1ST DUI	13	46.2	100.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	15.4
		2ND DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3RD DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		4TH+ DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
JUV TEHAMA	JUV TEHAMA	TOTAL	22	31.8	100.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	31.8
		1ST DUI	5	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		1ST DUI	101	95.0	97.0	90.1	2.0	0.0	1.0
		2ND DUI	43	97.7	97.7	16.3	76.7	0.0	4.7
CORNING	CORNING	3RD DUI	12	75.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	16.7
		4TH+ DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	157	93.6	97.5	62.4	28.0	0.0	3.2
		1ST DUI	158	93.0	100.0	81.6	5.1	0.0	1.3
		2ND DUI	39	82.1	100.0	7.7	64.1	0.0	7.7
RED BLUFF	RED BLUFF	3RD DUI	13	61.5	100.0	0.0	53.8	0.0	15.4
		4TH+ DUI	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	214	87.4	100.0	61.7	18.7	0.0	3.3
		1ST DUI	48	64.6	95.8	58.3	2.1	0.0	0.0
		2ND DUI	27	70.4	96.3	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0
TRINITY	TRINITY	3RD DUI	8	87.5	87.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	0.0
		4TH+ DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	86	68.6	94.2	36.0	18.6	1.2	0.0
		1ST DUI	27	100.0	18.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	27	100.0	18.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
TULARE	JUV VISALIA	TOTAL	27	100.0	18.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2006 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL N	PROBATION %	JAIL %	1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM %	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM %	30-MONTH PROGRAM %	IGNITION INTERLOCK %
TULARE	DINUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	242	94.6	99.2	80.2	4.1	0.0	3.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	62	95.2	98.4	14.5	64.5	0.0	11.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	92.3	100.0	15.4	38.5	0.0	38.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	72.7	100.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	36.4
		TOTAL	328	93.9	99.1	62.5	17.7	0.0	7.3
	PORTERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	573	95.1	94.6	83.4	2.4	0.0	1.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	214	95.8	97.2	9.3	72.4	0.0	18.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	62	90.3	96.8	3.2	74.2	0.0	33.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	38	57.9	94.7	5.3	23.7	0.0	23.7
		TOTAL	887	93.3	95.4	56.6	25.3	0.0	8.9
TULARE	TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	935	96.1	80.6	83.6	2.4	0.0	1.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	271	95.6	97.0	12.2	73.4	0.0	14.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	74	93.2	97.3	6.8	73.0	0.0	32.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	87.5	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	1288	95.8	85.2	63.7	21.5	0.0	6.1
	VISALIA DIV	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	100	80.0	81.0	38.0	4.0	0.0	6.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	64.5	83.9	9.7	22.6	0.0	16.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	66.7	88.9	0.0	33.3	0.0	11.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	25	44.0	100.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0
		TOTAL	174	70.7	85.1	23.6	10.9	0.0	8.6
TUOLUMNE	TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	265	92.5	96.2	85.7	2.6	0.0	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	105	97.1	100.0	7.6	81.0	0.0	5.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	95.5	100.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	45.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	20.0	100.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	402	92.0	97.5	58.5	23.9	0.0	4.5
	VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3400	97.9	88.0	71.8	0.9	0.0	7.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	817	98.8	96.8	10.8	60.3	0.0	68.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	207	98.6	96.6	4.8	61.8	0.0	82.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	65	61.5	100.0	0.0	47.7	0.0	61.5
		TOTAL	4489	97.5	90.2	56.6	15.2	0.0	22.5
YOLO	YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	774	95.3	94.4	75.1	2.3	0.0	1.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	193	97.9	97.9	41.5	33.7	0.0	42.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	50	90.0	96.0	16.0	30.0	0.0	64.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	52.4	90.5	0.0	9.5	0.0	9.5
		TOTAL	1038	94.7	95.1	64.5	9.6	0.0	12.0
	YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	75.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	20.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3
		TOTAL	21	76.2	100.0	23.8	14.3	0.0	9.5
YUBA	JUV YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MARYSVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	305	98.7	93.1	86.9	3.3	0.0	2.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	101	97.0	99.0	14.9	75.2	0.0	12.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	100.0	11.8	58.8	0.0	47.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	66.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	429	97.9	94.4	65.7	22.8	0.5	6.5
BEALE AFB	BEALE AFB	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



TABLE B5: DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS AND 3- AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM DRIVERS

YEAR GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT FEMALE	MEAN AGE	PERCENT COMMERCIAL DRIVERS	MONTHS IN STUDY	2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS PER 100 DRIVERS			ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES			
						TOTAL ACCIDENTS	ALCOHOL ACCIDENTS	MAJOR CONVICTIONS	TOTAL ACCIDENTS	INJURY ACCIDENTS	MAJOR VIOLATIONS	MOVING VIOLATIONS
<u>7/06-6/07</u>												
No program	2,724 (37.5%)	25.0	33.2	2.8	16.1	2.9	1.0	.17	1.42	.33	.45	2.23
Alcohol education program	4,534 (62.5%)	26.2	32.8	2.1	15.9	2.6	0.8	.12	1.49	.33	.38	2.22
Statistical significance test		$\chi^2 = 1.33$	$F = 1.8$	$\chi^2 = 3.68$	$F = 12.9^*$	$F = 4.1^*$	$F = 6.7^*$	$F = 2.6$	$F = 107.9^*$	$F = 0.02$	$F = 214.1^*$	$F = 0.04$
<u>2006</u>												
3-month program	24,455 (74.8%)	26.0	33.0	1.5	19.5	3.3	1.5	.09	1.47	.32	.40	2.18
9-month program	8,235 (25.2%)	26.7	36.8	1.7	19.2	4.1	2.6	.05	1.50	.34	.39	2.21
Statistical significance test		$\chi^2 = 1.45$	$F = 602.8^*$	$\chi^2 = 1.79$	$F = 21.9^*$	$F = 115.9^*$	$F = 478.1^*$	$F = 8.2^*$	$F = 57.1^*$	$F = 167.7^*$	$F = 49^*$	$F = 27.9^*$

\* $p < .05$